

Also, petition of Swayne, Hoyt & Co., of San Francisco, Cal., against the increase of the tariff on rice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, Cal., for early completion of the new Golden Gate Life-Saving Station; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, Cal., favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Missouri, against the income tax on mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of the Cigar Makers' Union, against any increase of the revenue tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Credit Men's Association of the State of Utah, favoring a reform in the banking and currency laws; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KALANIANAOLE: Memorial of the Honolulu Merchants' Association, of Honolulu, against reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of sundry citizens of the fifteenth congressional district of Pennsylvania, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Fort Covington, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation relative to closing the gates of the Panama Exposition in California in 1915 on Sunday; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: Petition of the American Association for International Conciliation, favoring the repeal of the law with reference to Panama Canal tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STONE: Memorial of the council of the city of Peoria, Ill., favoring Government ownership of the telegraph and telephone; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: Memorial of Horse Creek Grange, Adams County, Colo., favoring Government loans on farm property; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Farmers' Institute of Larimer County, Colo., against the reduction of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 35 citizens of Douglas, Colo., favoring the placing of sugar and wool on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 175 citizens of Eaton, 130 citizens of Greeley, 350 citizens of Loveland, 400 citizens of Fort Collins, 320 citizens of Sterling, 295 citizens of Longmont, 153 citizens of Fort Morgan, and 55 citizens of Windsor, all in the State of Colorado, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce, of Buffalo, N. Y.; the Niagara Falls Milling Co.; and Henry D. Waters, of Buffalo, N. Y., against the duty on wheat, oats, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Allied Printing Trades Council of New York, against reduction of the duty on printed matter; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Cutlery Co., of Chicago, Ill.; the Clement Manufacturing Co. and the Northampton Cutlery Co., of Northampton; the Lamson & Goodnow Manufacturing Co., of Shelburne Falls; the John Russell Cutlery Co., of Turners Falls, Mass.; the Goodell Co., of Antrim, N. H.; Landers, Frary & Clark, of New Britain; the Meriden Cutlery Co., of Meriden, Conn.; and the Ontario Knife Co., of Franklinville, N. Y., against reduction of the duty on table cutlery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers, of New York, against a change in Schedule K of the tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Griswold Worsted Co., of New York, N. Y., favoring a greater difference in duty than that in the tariff bill on raw hair and manufactured products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of manufacturers, dyers, and finishers of cotton, corduroys, velvets, and velveteens, asking that the present rates of duty under the act of 1909, Schedule I, be continued; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Rochester Button Co. and the German-American Button Co., of Rochester; the Seneca Button Co., of

Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; and the Federal Button Co., of Newark, N. J., against reduction of the duty on vegetable ivory buttons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Hanlon & Goodman Co. and 27 other companies of New York, Massachusetts, Maryland, Ohio, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and Illinois, protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on brushes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the American Spice Trade Association, New York, N. Y., protesting against the levying of the same duty on ground spices as on the whole spices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Lancaster Leaf Tobacco Board of Trade, Lancaster, Pa., protesting against placing Philippine tobacco and cigars on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York Association of Biology Teachers, New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of legislation prohibiting the importation of feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial use; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the placing of Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Bricklayers B. & P. Union, No. 1, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring an amendment to the Sherman law in relation to trade-unions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Cigar Makers Local Union, No. 132, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against free trade with the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., policy holders in mutual life insurance companies, against the income-tax provision; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Mayor George M. Wright and other citizens of Worcester, Mass., favoring repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from payment of tolls, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Worcester County League of Unitarian Women, favoring the passage of the Page vocational education bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WITHERSPOON: Memorial of Finklea Ben and Ephriam Sam, Carthage, Miss., requesting Congress to grant their share in the Choctaw Indian fund; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 30, 1913.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, deliver us, we beseech Thee, from the bondage of sin, with its blighting, corroding, damning effects, incarcerating the soul, shutting from it the light of Thy countenance, the warmth of Thy love, the influence of divine help; eliminating self-respect; damning every avenue which leads to freedom, peace, and righteousness. We thank Thee for Thy patience, forbearance, and love, which continues its work in the spirit of the Master who revealed Thy heart to the children of men and poured out its love on Calvary that we might live in Thee, our God and our Redeemer. "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong. Let all that ye do be done in love." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

96. Opera and field glasses, telescopes, microscopes, photographic and projection lenses and optical instruments and frames or mountings for the same; all the foregoing not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 25, line 7, by inserting, after the word "optical," the following words: "and surveying."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

97. Stained or painted glass windows, or parts thereof, and all mirrors, not exceeding in size 144 square inches, with or without frames or cases; incandescent electric-light bulbs and lamps, with or without filaments; and all glass or manufactures of glass or paste or of which glass or paste is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for in this section, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 17, after the word "section," strike out "30" and insert in lieu thereof "40."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the gentlemen who are the proponents of this bill and those who are opposing it is that the friends of the bill are levying duties for the purpose of raising revenue only, and those who are opposing the bill believe in protection and believe the bill is not sufficiently protective to American industries.

Much has been said upon the other side in answer to the suggestion that the Democrats are giving no attention whatever to the labor question, and that they are eliminating the matter of wages altogether; and the substance of what is said on the other side is that the labor unions actually fix the wages in the United States; and this in spite of the fact that it is known to everybody who knows anything about labor organizations at all, that England, the best labor-organized country in the world, pays the poorest wages.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], in his usual eloquent way, pleaded on several occasions yesterday for the labor of the mills, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] came in late last night with an eloquent discourse on the ability of the labor unions to hold up the wages of the country, and he spoke in opposition to the industries of the country upon which labor depends. He would exalt labor by razing the mill. He would exalt labor by taking away the wage. The gentleman is always eloquent, and most eloquent when he treats of the "down-trodden mill working girls," whose wages in fact are superior to those of many of the girls who work in department stores or who engage in domestic service.

I rise this morning to say in support of this amendment that the labor unions of this country generally stand for protection, and they do not stand for a lessening of the wage, as contemplated by the Democratic Party in this bill. If gentlemen ask for authority for this statement I cite numerous labor bodies in the district from which I come that protest against this bill upon the ground that it cuts wages needlessly or menaces the business out of which they get their employment. I have in hand, in opposition to the reduction of duty proposed in this paragraph 97 with regard to stained and painted glass windows, a communication from labor itself, from the Decorative Glass Workers' Protective Association, men who work at this trade. In the course of their communication they say that they protest against the reduction of duties on manufactured stained glass. The secretary of the union was instructed to respectfully say that every effort should be used to prevent the reduction of duty on manufactured stained-glass windows from a 40 to a 30 per cent duty, as is proposed in the Underwood bill. The communication states that—

Paragraph 659 of the bill, which has been inserted for the sole benefit of the importer, means that the stained glass for church use shall be admitted free of duty.

That eliminates the making of stained glass in the United States.

We most emphatically protest against the passage of this law—

Says this protective labor union—

which will destroy the industry in which we earn our livelihood.

What are you legislating for? Are you legislating in order that these men, who earn their living by the sweat of their brows, shall be deprived of the daily wage and of the bread and butter necessary for their families? It would seem that this is exactly what you propose to do in this instance.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of the labor employed in this trade, the men who are behind the guns, those who support the families of the land, I ask you to lift the embargo upon their business and to raise this duty against cheap foreign labor from 30 to 40 per cent.

The letter above referred to is as follows:

DECORATIVE GLASS WORKERS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION
OF PHILADELPHIA AND VICINITY.
LOCAL No. 41, A. G. W. I. A.,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 25, 1913.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a special meeting of the above-named association, held April 23, 1913, the subject of reducing the duty on manufactured stained-glass windows was thoroughly discussed, and I was instructed to respectfully request that you use every effort to prevent a reduction of the duty on manufactured stained-glass windows from a 40 to a 30 per cent duty, as is proposed in the Underwood bill.

Paragraph 659 of this bill, which has been inserted for the sole benefit of the importer, means that stained glass for church use shall be admitted free of duty.

We most emphatically protest the passing of this law, which will destroy the industry in which we earn our livelihood.

Therefore we most respectfully request that you give this matter your sincere consideration and support, in order that there will be no reduction of the duty on stained-glass windows in any manner or form.

Thanking you in advance for your support and influence, I remain,

Sincerely, yours,

JOSEPH M. RICHIE, Secretary.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] says that the labor unions in the country favor a protective tariff. The members of labor organizations of the country do favor a protective tariff, but that kind of a protective tariff which will give them some of the benefits of that tariff. I sat here yesterday from the beginning of the reading of the tariff bill until 11 o'clock at night. The first schedule up was a very technical one—the chemical schedule. So far as we could observe there were but two men on the floor, or, at best, three men, who were informed in any way as to its technicalities. Of course, first of all was the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who knows everything. After him the gentleman in charge of the schedule, Mr. HARRISON, who has made a special study of it; and after him Mr. METZ, who introduced himself to the country and to the House as being the only man in this Congress who had taken an appeal from the Democratic caucus to the Ways and Means Committee and had won.

But the most significant thing in the consideration of the first and second schedules here has been the activity of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]. He, more than any other Republican on the floor, offers amendments, and those amendments are typical of him, his doctrine, and that of the Republican Party as it is to-day. Now, he offers these amendments conservatively and with some reluctance. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is a standpatter in the sense that he is a standstill, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is a standpatter with a rising inflection. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania offered as his first amendment a proposition to raise the duty on alkalis and alkaloids 5 per cent; he was going up. He started to change the duty on peanut oil.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Wait till I get through. He started to change the duty on peanut oil, but discovering it was now on the free list and that the Democrats proposed to put a duty of 6 cents a gallon on it, he withdrew the amendment and stood for the Democratic proposition.

Mr. MOORE. Does not the gentleman understand the motive in referring to peanut oil?

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman will wait until I get through with this statement, I will yield. I understand that the next amendment which the gentleman offered was an amendment with reference to yellow prussiate of potash. In the bill it carries a duty of one and one-quarter of a cent per pound, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, following out the Republican policy of high protection, offered an amendment to increase it to 2 cents per pound. On the item of soap he offered an amendment to increase the duty of 40 per cent ad valorem to a duty of 50 per cent.

Mr. MOORE. That was perfumed soap.

Mr. MURDOCK. Perfumed soap. On glass bottles he took the duty offered in the Underwood bill and offered an amendment increasing it to 60 per cent. The gentleman, in his amendments, is indicative of his party. He believes in a high protective tariff.

Mr. MOORE. I do.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman believes in a prohibitive tariff.

Mr. MOORE. Not necessarily.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman is put on the Ways and Means Committee from Pennsylvania. He has been chosen for that committee among the large number of men from Pennsylvania on the Republican side; and a good many of those men

here, by the way, received more Progressive votes in Pennsylvania than they did Republican votes.

Mr. MOORE. Was not I elected by votes of Democrats, Republicans, and Progressives alike?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania should observe the rule.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, in the course of time and under the rules of seniority in this House—if the Republican Party should come back into power—with Mr. Moore, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, does anyone here have any doubt what sort of a tariff bill he would write? Does anyone here think that Mr. Moore would wait for a report from a tariff commission? Everyone here ought to know that he is a high protectionist, and in writing a tariff bill he would out-Payne PAYNE himself. [Laughter.] Now I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. That is very kind of the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, in line with what the gentleman from Kansas has said, I am not sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] has carefully considered the amendment that he has presented at the desk to protect labor. The complaints against the reduction from 45 to 35 per cent is that labor is not properly protected. We reduced it in order that the schedule might become somewhat competitive. Not that that would affect labor; we do not affect labor—that is, if the manufacturer is willing to give labor a fair portion of the protective tariff, or incidental protection or protective tariff, or a revenue tariff, that he gets at the customhouse.

I find from the census reports lying on my table that in round figures in this stained-glass paragraph under consideration the annual production in 1909, the last census, was about \$16,000,000. The labor cost in round figures was about \$5,000,000. That shows that in this industry the amount of labor involved in the cost of production was about 31 per cent. This bill gives a tariff rate of 30 per cent, within 1 per cent of the total labor cost in this industry in the United States. I imagine they do not make this glass abroad for nothing. There must be some labor cost over there. There must be some cost of transportation of that glass to the United States, and there must be some insurance rates. Therefore, as a matter of fact, I think that probably the cost of making this glass is about 40 per cent of the labor cost in this country. But we have not only in this bill given a rate that is sufficient to cover the labor cost, but far more than would cover the difference in the labor cost and enough to cover some incidental cost in addition.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that under the free-trade clause much stained glass can now come into the country for churches and for institutions of that character?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think it will be a very small portion. I am not sure about it and I do not assert it as an absolute fact; but my recollection is that the stained-glass windows for churches came in free under the Dingley bill.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is aware that we passed a bill, I think, in the last Congress, relieving certain importers of duties that had actually been paid upon stained-glass windows that came in for churches, which, of course, if tolerated to any large extent, or if allowed to come in through any loophole in a free-trade clause in this bill would mean that foreign stained glass would eliminate that business in the United States.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is a very good illustration of the difference in the way that side of the House legislates and the way this side of the House legislates. My recollection is that under the Dingley bill stained-glass windows for churches were free, as in this bill, and that the Payne bill put a tax on all stained glass, and made no discrimination. I recognize the fact that the gentleman's side of the House did pass some bills admitting stained-glass windows for churches free. In other words, you were playing favorites with the churches just as you played favorites with other people. We propose to give to the churches free admission of stained glass for any church that desires to apply for it without having to come to this Congress to get that privilege. As I said, there is a comparatively small amount of this glass used for that purpose. I do not think it is going to seriously embarrass this industry, and it is certainly made for a good cause.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the statements that have been made here by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Murdock] are not quite correct, and I hardly think either one of them desires to make a misleading statement in regard to the posi-

tion of organized labor in respect to the question of a protective tariff. It is true there are some unions and there are some officials of unions that have been influenced by their employers to exercise what influence they had to keep up a high protective tariff, those officials of unions thinking probably there might be less danger of conflict with those corporations; but in my opinion it is an insult to the intelligence of the representative trades-union men in this country to leave the impression that they are in favor of a protective tariff or that they are under the impression that a protective tariff ever has, does now, or can benefit the wageworkers of the country.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I can not yield at this time.

Mr. MURDOCK. Not as an organization, but as members.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. As members or organizations. I want to say to the gentleman that I solved this question to my own satisfaction and thorough conviction as a workingman and not as a partisan or politician. When I was slinging the hammer, driving rivets, I studied this question out so that it left no doubt in my mind that the high protective tariff argument was a delusion and a snare. In the first place, it does not keep up the price of labor. The only thing that has kept up the price of labor in this country is a unity of action of the working people themselves and their efficiency and stability in standing for a fair share of the wealth that they produce. If the argument be correct that the protective tariff has kept up the price of labor, who in the name of God pays for it? Is it anyone else besides those who work? Who are the great consuming masses of this country but the laboring people; and is it not taking out of one pocket and putting into another? I want to show another thing to convince you that organized labor is not supporting a protective-tariff policy. Every man who was elected to this Congress as a labor man you will find will vote for this bill, no matter which side of the House he is on.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I have not the time to yield and say what I desire to say. I would be glad to yield otherwise. I know whereof I speak. I have opposed the protective-tariff policy in the trades-union movement. I know there are a few there who favor it, but I am speaking in regard to the matter in the main as the great majority both of the officers and the members of the trades-unions believe. Now, let us see what kind of protection the Republican Party or the country under the domination of the Republican Party has given the working people of this country. I have here figures compiled as to the average wage scale of the country. The average wage earners receive \$9.99 per week. The average wage scale that the salaried workmen and the wage earners receive was \$11.35 a week. If there is anybody who thinks that a workingman can live and raise a family on wages of an average of \$11.35 a week in Chicago or in any other of the industrial centers at present prices, if he knows how it can be done, it will be very valuable to have the receipt. Not only that, but if I have the time I desire to have read this clipping, and it is certainly something to boast of—the conditions that the Republican Party through its domination have created in this country for the working people. They have destroyed them physically and morally. I want to say to gentlemen on both sides of this House that I have never been so encouraged in all my life as by the fact that at this time educated men, men in high places, are beginning to see the necessity of exercising their influence to give relief from the conditions which this small clipping will show to exist.

The Clerk read as follows:

INDUSTRIALISM MAIN CAUSE—CORNELL PROFESSOR CHARGES IT RESPONSIBLE FOR CRIME AND INSANITY.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa., March 17.

That industrialism is the principal cause of the filling of jails and insane asylums, the killing off of one-third of all babies in the first year of their lives, and the restricting of other births was declared by Dr. M. G. Schapp, professor of neuropathology at Cornell University, in an address here yesterday at the conference on mental hygiene. "Degeneration and race suicide," he said, "increase with industrial supremacy, and the stress of modern competition is the cause of much of the insanity. Employment of women in factories and the almost ceaseless activity demanded of all classes in efforts to retain their positions are leading causes in the breakdown of mental health."

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Gentlemen, if that condition is something you want to boast of under your protective tariff policy in this country, why, you have that pleasure, but it seems to me that it takes a great deal of nerve, an almost galvanized nerve, for men to get up and claim—in spite of the efforts of organized labor and its friends—to be responsible for this condition described. It seems to me that it is certainly nothing to boast of on the part of those who have been in power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the head of the bumblebee party this morning is not imputing motives to his colleagues that are not warranted, and is rather leaving the muckraking business to the real head of his party and is making a criticism that is at least not insulting. He says that I am a "standstill" and yet I put on the statute books a protective tariff bill and lowered the duty more than any tariff bill ever written and put on the statute books up to that day from a previous tariff. [Applause on the Republican side.] Why, gentlemen, it reminds me of a young reporter who came around to see me before I came to Washington last fall, a reporter who was engaged on an independent paper that printed Democratic editorials every day, except they varied them by putting in boosts for the Bull Moose Party in order to encourage the vote for the Bull Moose candidate in my district, and he asked me how I stood on several questions. I told him. Finally he wanted to know how I stood on the amendment to the Constitution providing for the popular election of Senators. I said, "My dear boy, I have been voting for that for 16 years, and I have voted for it three or four times." "You have been voting for it?" "Yes." "Why," he said, "that is a Progressive proposition." I said, "Why, good heavens, my boy, I voted for that long before any of the present race of Progressives had been politically born." "Well," he said, "all these are Progressive measures you have been voting for." And now comes along this astute gentleman from Kansas and says I am a "standstill." Well, I never have advanced to that plane where I accuse every man with whom I disagree of some sinister motive; where I had witnessed a fight in which men I did not agree with were spending their best energies to accomplish a purpose, I did not come around some time afterwards and accuse them of not acting sincerely.

Then my friend from Alabama tells the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we have admitted some stained glass for certain churches free of duty. There was always a good reason for it. Perhaps it arose out of the ignorance of the people who imported it and got in a hole, and so we remitted that duty.

He says, "You play favorites." We do not. We exempted two or three churches, but we do not play favorites. He put stained glass on the free list for all churches. He is playing favorite by the wholesale if we are chargeable of playing it at all.

And so we go on here. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] says he is a labor-union man, and he gives it as his opinion that labor does not get any benefit out of the tariff. I refer him to that great head of the Federation of Labor of the United States, Samuel Gompers, who went through Europe. He said it was a fact that our laboring men could live here at the same rate that the laboring people live there, and for the same amount of money here obtain shelter, food, and clothing, and all if they would choose to live on the same plane, but they demanded something better—a better house, better food, better clothing, and better conditions for their families. He was bound to say in conclusion as to the whole matter that we have advanced to a higher plane in providing for the laboring people in the United States.

And on this very question of glass, an intelligent labor-union glassmaker, as intelligent as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], speaking as well as any Member on the floor of this House in his proposition to the committee, was asked the usual question, "You say you need this for the benefit of labor?" His reply was, "Yes." "How are you sure you are going to get any benefit of it?" His prompt reply was, "You give us a protective tariff and we will take our share of it, as we have always been doing and are doing now."

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield now? I would like to say something as to his statement concerning Mr. Gompers.

Mr. PAYNE. I can not yield now. And that was true of this glass industry. Laborers are as well organized there as they are in any other industry in the United States. This was the testimony of an intelligent man, and, if I am not vastly mistaken, he says he voted for Woodrow Wilson last fall and is a Democrat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will ask that the gentleman from New York be given five minutes more.

Mr. PAYNE. I do not want it. I will get in again by and by. I like to deal these out in installments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] is recognized.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, this debate at this point illustrates to me what seems to be the great evil of a protective tariff. The gentleman from New York has well said, with reference to the special enactments favoring certain churches, that

there was always a good reason for each special favor. There "always is a good reason" for favor. I want to warn my Progressive friends that declare they are for a protective tariff, but a reasonable protection, that there is absolutely no difference between them and my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who declares he is for a high protective tariff for the simple reason that every man seeking a higher duty on the commodity that he is interested in always finds a good reason for the special favor he wants. And when our friends the Progressives run after the protection idea there is no limit to the distance which each one of them will go in behalf of the interests in which each one is interested, and there is no limit to the length they will go in combining with other interests in order to get what they want. You may think you are so virtuous you can not ask too much, but there is no possible line you can draw if you start in with the idea that we are protecting certain industries. The principle is befouling and corrupting. It is like all evil.

Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
As, to be hated, needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

You love your country. You really believe in justice to all and special privileges to none. You ought to be now on your knees, praying the prayer our Savior taught, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil."

The whole system was started in this country on the notion of easily raising a revenue to run the Government and incidentally, by just such mild and moderate protection as you now talk of, building up infant industries, and it has grown up to be a juggernaut that crushes out the life of the labor of this country. Come out of the darkness, Mr. Progressive, and stand for a tariff which is only for the benefit of the Government. There is no middle way. You can not satisfy the interests and serve the people. You say you are for a liberal administration. You say you are for protection but not for excessive protection, but no protection is excessive for the man who is interested. My friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORE, still says and he seems to think that a duty of 30 per cent will destroy or greatly reduce the wages of an industry that now has a 42 per cent protection when the whole percentage of labor in the products of that industry is only 31 per cent. I do not impute wrong motives to men who say these things. We can believe anything.

Why, we know that in times gone by good men have believed that infants not two spans long were burning in hell. And so a good man may believe that a 30 per cent duty on a product of an industry in which the labor element is only 31 per cent is still destructive to that industry. Let us be fair. Let us be honest. Let us obey the Constitution, which says that a tax on imports must be levied for governmental purposes, and let us refuse to violate it and break it, and decline so to levy taxes on imports as to give special favors to one class to the detriment of other classes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDY. No; I can not yield. No one sitting here believes that a protective tariff is in accordance with the spirit of the Constitution.

Mr. LENROOT. Do the gentleman's remarks also apply to the duty on the hair of the Angora goat? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY. That remark, I will say, also demonstrates that there is always a reason. I heard the leader of the other side say the other day that there are a million Angora goats in this country, and that out of that million 999,999 were located in Texas; and a few minutes afterwards a gentleman not from Texas got up and stated how many hundred thousand Angora goats there were in his State. [Laughter.] I would not know an Angora goat when I saw it, and if there are any in my district I do not know it. But I know this, that there is a reason for placing a duty on the hair of the Angora goat. Cloth produced from the hair of the Angora goat is a luxury. Most of it is used in equipping Pullman palace cars and automobiles, and little of it used by the common people, and a duty on it that will produce revenue is justified on that ground, whereas wool used in the production of the cloth which all our people use and want to use should not bear a tax. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And let the gentleman take this and bear it with sweet unction in his heart, that if there is one goat in Texas I am willing to sacrifice him. I will put him on the altar and give him to my people or to the people over there on that side. But if you are going to levy a duty do you want to levy it on the luxuries of life or on the necessities of life? The fewer the Angora goats there may be in this country the more certain it is that every dollar of duty laid on the hair of the Angora goat will go into

the Treasury and not into the pockets of special-privileged interests. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. In this bill is there a duty on rice? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY. I think there is. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Is rice a necessity or a luxury?

Mr. HARDY. I think rice is a necessity. And I will say, furthermore, that when the time comes to take the duties off other articles, we will take them off all necessities.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Why do not you take it off of rice?

Mr. MURDOCK. When will that time come?

Mr. HARDY. For my part, if I can not get all duties off of all common necessities, I would rather take some of them off than to lie down and let all the monstrous duties we now have on the commonest and cheapest necessities remain.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Why are you not willing to do it now?

Mr. HARDY. I am willing to do it, and I want to travel just as fast as we can, but on your side you want to pile the burdens up higher and higher.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. I am for a tariff that covers the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

Mr. HARDY. And yet you would vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], who wants a protection of 40 per cent on this item in which the whole labor cost is only 30 per cent.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But I shall not vote for this bill.

Mr. HARDY. Oh, no; you would not vote for this bill.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. No; but I would vote for a proper bill.

Mr. HARDY. Then the gentleman should vote for this bill.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. You do not show your faith by your works.

Mr. HARDY. Oh, you never did show your faith by your works, if you have that faith; that is, that you only wanted a duty to cover the difference in the cost of production here and abroad.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Do not let him have the last word. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. "Faith without works is dead." By your work on rice you shall be known. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDY. And by your works—your votes for high duties, not for revenue, but to benefit the few and burden the many—you are known, and I have got the last word. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fusible enamel, 20 per cent ad valorem; opal or cylinder glass tiles or tiling, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have listened to the remarks of the leader of the Progressive Party in this House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], and I want to state to him that I think his reflection or his criticism of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is uncalled for, in view of the fact that three years ago the gentleman from Kansas, on a roll call, voted to pass the Payne tariff bill through this House. He did it without a criticism or without an objection. He sat on this side of the House for 10 years, elected by a constituency in Kansas that believes in the policies of the Republican Party, and I doubt whether he can point to a single word or line of criticism or objection to the policy of his party during the time the Republicans of Kansas intrusted him with power in this House. The gentleman from Kansas the other day criticized this bill and read some letters from millers in his district who objected to the free importation of flour from Canada.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Will the gentleman be fair?

Mr. AUSTIN. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. I read a letter from a miller in Kansas who said that the bill was faulty in that it did not either put both wheat and flour on the free list, or put an equal duty on both, if a duty were to go on at all.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman from Kansas made an appeal in the interest of the millers of Kansas. He favors a protection on the flour industry of his district, as against the cheap flour industry of Canada. He opposed reciprocity in the interest of the agricultural constituents that he represented, and he stood still and stood pat against the importation of anything that would affect the interest of his immediate constituents; but when it comes to legislating in a tariff bill to protect the industries of the district represented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the district represented by myself in Tennessee, then the gentleman is in favor of a reduction that would permit the importation of foreign articles in competition with those manufactured in our districts.

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, the gentleman wants to keep within the facts.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; always.

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not vote against reciprocity; I voted for reciprocity.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; but the gentleman's party assailed President Taft, and that was one of the chief slogans against him in the Northwest, the fact that he favored reciprocity.

Mr. MURDOCK. But the gentleman made the accusation against me that I was standing for a local, personal interest as against the interests of the Nation. I voted for reciprocity.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then I accept the gentleman's statement. But he does not deny the statement that he voted for the Payne bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Not at all.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then the gentleman pleads guilty.

Mr. MURDOCK. I voted for the Payne bill when it passed the House; but I voted against it, as the gentleman did not, after it had been ruined in the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I voted against it in the House, and was the only Republican to do so, because it was seeking to put coal and iron ore on the free list, which affected my district; and had it placed flour and wheat on the free list, and the articles in which the gentleman's constituents are interested, he would have been untrue to his commission and their trust had he not voted against it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Now, let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. AUSTIN. Not unless I have more time. The gentleman from Kansas is a Progressive. He progressed here, holding a seat by virtue of the votes and the support of a Republican district for 10 years, and now he has changed his official designation in the directory from a Republican to a Progressive.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I dislike to make the point of order on these gentlemen, but some of our friends have discussed politics in reference to this bill in season and out of season.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will make the point of order against the gentleman from Kansas the next time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I must insist that the gentleman discuss the paragraph under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The gentleman from Tennessee will proceed in order.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], the labor leader—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am going to answer the gentleman on a question that he submitted here, and which he submitted without protest from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would say to the gentleman that the paragraph before the committee does not relate to that proposition. It has been passed.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman from Illinois discussed labor conditions in this country and Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is, of course, familiar with the rule, and if the point of order be insisted upon the Chair will state that he must proceed in order.

Mr. AUSTIN. All I ask is that the gentleman from Alabama will treat the Members of his side just as he does me.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to my friend from Tennessee making speeches, but I must insist that this bill progress.

Now, I will withdraw the point of order if, after the gentleman has finished his discussion on this particular matter, he will let us go along and discuss the paragraphs of the bill.

Mr. AUSTIN. I say to the gentleman from Alabama that when he permits anyone on that side of the House to make these general speeches on the tariff, I intend to exercise the same right in reply.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that those speeches have been made on both sides of the House. I have been trying to let them run, but the gentleman has made quite

a number of speeches in this debate, and most of them entirely foreign to the subject matter before the House.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think I told the gentleman before we entered upon the discussion of this bill under the five-minute rule that I had no opportunity to make a speech in the general debate, and my only opportunity was to do it under the five-minute rule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing that the gentleman should proceed this time, but I intend to insist on the enforcement of the rule hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama withdraws the point of order. The gentleman from Tennessee will proceed.

Mr. AUSTIN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], speaking as a labor man, decries the condition of the laboring people of this country. I commend to him the volume entitled "Labor in Europe and America," by Samuel Gompers, written as the result of a trip in 1909 through England, France, Austria, Italy, Germany, and the industrial centers of those countries. I wish to read a few extracts from that remarkable book.

On page 42 Mr. Gompers, the great American labor leader, says:

The deepest impression that England made upon me came from its poverty. Physically thousands have become unfit, and are almost irremediable from idleness. Vice and the result of idleness make of them ready victims to death. Poverty is on view in all parts of London; slums and back streets border on fashionable thoroughfares; figures in dirt and rags slouch along amid the gay and well-attired promenaders of the park. With regret I must confess I came away from London with a sense of depression. From time to time since, those numbers of demoralized, degraded objects which ought to be men and women have formed in my mind's eye a procession moving along together past me, mournful, hopeless, repellent—a disgrace to our boasted civilization.

The last paragraph in Mr. Gompers's book reads as follows:

The Old World is not our world. Its social problems, its economic philosophies, its current political questions are not linked up with America. All the people of the globe may be on the broad highway to social justice, peace among men of all tongues, and universal brotherhood, but all the nations and Governments have not reached the same points on the road. In the procession America is first.

Beginning on page 221 Mr. Gompers quotes some figures on the comparative wage scale of this and European countries. Let me quote them for the information of the House and the country, and for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN], who, in the speech he has just made, expresses the opinion that a protective tariff is not beneficial to the American working people. According to Mr. Gompers, wages run as follows in the shipyards in England and Scotland:

Platers, riveters, and calkers, holders-up, from \$6 to less than \$9.50 a week. In Germany only three or four of the trades average over \$300 per annum; most of the averages run less than \$250. For instance, the Berlin Saddlers' Organization, 9 hours per day, \$6.28 to \$6.52 per week. The Hamburg shipbuilders, \$7.90 to \$11.62 per week. The Berlin plumbers, \$8 to \$9 per week.

In Budapest bricklayers, among the best-paid workmen in the building trades, get from \$1 to \$1.20 per day. In the winter they find unskilled work at 60 cents a day. Budapest has 1,000 female cigar makers working in the Government factories at 30 to 40 cents a day. Miners in northern Hungary sometimes attain to the level of 60 cents per day. The wages in Italy reach the highest point in Milan, the great modern and commercial city of the Kingdom.

The following are some of the demands of the unions:

The painters and paper hangers a minimum of 60 cents, 80 cents, and \$1 per day (American money), 8½ hours in winter and 10 hours the rest of the year. Stationary firemen, 9 cents an hour; gold-leaf workers, \$1.20 per day; assistants, 75 cents, 9 hours; bookbinders, 80 cents a day. In the building trades, minimum per hour, 9 cents; lithographers, graded, \$8.40, \$7.80, and \$7 a week. Street cleaners, graded, 78, 72, 67, 60, and 45 cents a day.

The policemen in London get \$6 to \$9 a week; in Paris, \$6 to \$8; in Vienna or Rome, \$5 to \$7 per week; and in New York, \$20 to \$30 a week.

Mr. Gompers states, on page 228 of his book, that—

The printing trade, in all Europe at the highest point in union organization, affords a basis for wage comparisons. In New York the union weekly scale for compositors on morning newspapers is \$31; on bookwork, \$21. In London the book scale is \$9s. (less than \$9.50); in Paris, the minimum \$9; in Milan, \$7 (5.20 lire) per day; in Austria the towns and cities are divided into six classes for compositors' weekly wages, running, respectively, \$4.40, \$4.80, \$5.20, \$5.60, \$5.80, and \$6.20; in Budapest the minimum scale is \$4.80.

To sum up, Mr. Gompers states that wages are more than twice as much in this country as in Europe, and the hours of labor on the other side longer, the latter being from 9 to 12 and 14 hours in some of the cotton industries. In the matter of the cost of living, he states that if the American workingman would deprive himself as the European wage earner is compelled to do, the cost of living would be the same.

In conclusion I have quoted Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor, against the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] says he wishes to proceed with the discussion of the provisions of this bill, and I propose for a few moments to satisfy him on that point if I can. The statements he has made with reference to the percentage which the wages paid for labor bear

to the total value of the product in this industry are wholly misleading and, in fact, entirely incorrect. They are in line with the remarks which the gentleman made last evening with reference to the pottery industry. He stated then that the pottery industry in this country produced products amounting to \$67,000,000, and that the wages paid were \$29,000,000. The figures which the gentleman gave were not for the pottery industry but for the pottery, fire-clay, and terra-cotta industry combined, and it is well known that the terra-cotta and fire-clay industries have a much lower wage scale than that which is paid in the crockery line. Proceeding on those figures the gentleman drew the deduction that the percentage of wages in the pottery manufacture was only 38 per cent. As a matter of fact it is over 50 per cent, and in most cases in the china factories about 60 per cent.

I hold in my hand a statement from one of the largest concerns operating in this country, manufacturing china and white ware of certain kinds. Their product last year amounted to \$1,800,000. Of this amount \$1,120,000, or over 60 per cent, was paid in wages—handed out in the pay envelopes to their workmen. Yet the gentleman has proceeded to draw the provisions of this bill in accordance with his statement that 38 per cent was all that was paid on the articles which were manufactured under paragraphs 81 and 82 thereof.

The gentleman said in that same connection that he thought a tariff board was necessary sometimes for the benefit of his Republican friends. It is necessary for them, and it is doubly necessary for our Democratic friends when they persist in putting forth such misleading statistics, and when they deny, as they have been obliged to in some cases, the statistics from their own handbook and their own report which they have presented in connection with this bill. I am like the gentleman from Ohio who addressed the committee on the subject of a tariff board the other day. I have never been able to perceive why a Democrat should not be able to make calculations as well as a Republican, and why, when a tariff board is organized for the purpose of obtaining facts, a Democrat can not ascertain those facts and make those calculations as well as a Republican. But they have had so much trouble all along with their figures that I begin to doubt the mathematics of the Democratic Party.

When we were discussing this subject the other evening the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] if he could not be fair, and the gentleman from Texas, wishing to be quite truthful, I suppose, said no, he could not. Now, if gentlemen can neither figure nor be fair, I will admit that they are of no use upon a tariff board. Otherwise I can not see any reason why the tariff board should not be made up to work in perfect harmony, although its members differ in their political faith, and give us what the Tariff Board which we formerly had gave us—harmonious results and unanimous reports, no matter of what party they are made up.

Now, this being the situation it emphasizes the necessity of a tariff board in order that we may have some correct figures upon which to base these rates. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], in speaking of the amount of labor employed in this glassware schedule, lumped the whole schedule together, including glassware of the cheapest kind, in which the labor is a small percentage, with that where the labor constitutes by far the greater part of the cost of the product, as in the particular provisions which are now under consideration. I submit that this is an unfair and improper way of making up a schedule. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's remarks are about as close to the facts as can be expected. Now here is a paragraph relating to stained-glass windows, covering most of the items that are in the census report. How can you get closer to governmental figures than when the census report picks out a paragraph on which to give statistics? I hold the report in my hand. It says:

Glass cutting, staining and ornamenting.

That is what is involved in this paragraph.

It says that the total wages scale was \$5,249,000, and the total production was \$16,100,000. The average amount of wages paid in that industry as fixed by the census was 31 per cent. Of course, I do not expect gentlemen on that side of the House who have for five decades gone to school to the interested manufacturers of this country, who are unwilling to recognize anyone in authority as to what interests the people of the United States on a tariff bill, except information that comes from a source that had such interest, to take the returns of their own Government as to the amount of the wages spent in the industry. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on this paragraph.

Mr. FORDNEY. If the gentleman will permit, I would like a little time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, last evening, in the discussion between the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] and myself about the importations and productions of earthenware, and so on, some figures were given, but the ad valorem rates as fixed in the bill included everything under earthenware. It included sewer pipe and tile and terra cotta, and does not relate to chinaware, about which I was talking.

Some gentlemen have said that the Republicans had heretofore, in the preparation of their tariff bills, listened absolutely to the manufacturers. I send to the Clerk's desk a letter that has been handed to me to show that there are others besides manufacturers interested in the preparation of our tariff bills.

The Clerk read as follows:

AMALGAMATED GLASS WORKERS'
INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Boston, Mass., April 25, 1913.

Mr. SAMUEL E. WINSLOW,
Representative, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Decorative Glassworkers of Boston, Local 28, at their last meeting instructed me to write you to protest against section 659, page 132, House bill, being passed, which reduces the duty on painted and stained glass windows imported into this country, and which, if it becomes a law, will seriously affect our trade, which at present is none too well paid, and will throw a majority of our members out of work.

Yours, very truly,

[SEAL.]

M. T. MOONEY, Secretary.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have sat here, as have other gentlemen, and heard arguments on both sides of the House and evidently in the middle, with nothing but criticism and faultfinding. When God Almighty blew the breath of life into some men He must have been bilious [laughter], because they have kicked from the time the light of day came to them to the present time and never stand for anything to build up, but always ready to tear down. Gentlemen, I do hope that in the discussion over this bill such discussion may hereafter be eliminated and the discussion and arguments confined to merits or demerits of the propositions before the House and not engage in so much personality. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired, and, without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHEDULE C—METALS AND MANUFACTURES OF.

104. Iron in pigs, iron kentledge, spiegeleisen, wrought and cast scrap iron and scrap steel, 8 per cent ad valorem; but nothing shall be deemed scrap iron or scrap steel except secondhand or waste or refuse iron or steel fit only to be remanufactured; ferromanganese, chrome or chromium metal, ferrochrome or ferrochromium, ferromolybdenum, ferrophosphorus, ferrotitanium, ferrotungsten, ferrovanadium, molybdenum, titanium, tantalum, tungsten or wolfram metal, and ferrosilicon, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 16, insert after the word "ferrosilicon" the words "and other alloys used in the manufacture of steel."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether his amendment will increase or decrease the tariff on these articles?

Mr. PALMER. It will decrease the tariff.

Mr. MANN. What is the rate now?

Mr. PALMER. I have in mind only two such alloys. Cobalt is one, which I understand now would come in at 25 per cent.

Mr. MANN. How does it come in now?

Mr. PALMER. As metals not enumerated.

Mr. MANN. Under the existing law?

Mr. PALMER. Under the Payne law.

Mr. MANN. Under the bill without this amendment it would come in in the same way.

Mr. PALMER. I suppose so. We put it in in order to make all pay the same rate. We believe they ought to pay the same rate; they are constantly used in the manufacture of steel.

Mr. MANN. In the metal schedule bill of last year the rate was fixed at 10 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. On the ferro alloys?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman offers this amendment to come in just before the 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. The amendment I am offering is to insert, after the word "ferrosilicon," "and other alloys used in the manufacture of steel."

Mr. MANN. The ad valorem in the schedule last year was 10 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. No; it was 15 per cent in the last bill.

Mr. MANN. I will accept the gentleman's statement, but my recollection was that it was 10 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman is mistaken. I have the Underwood bill of last year before me, and it carried 15 per cent last year for ferro alloys. What the gentleman may be thinking of is pig iron, which carried a rate of 10 per cent in the same paragraph last year and in the Senate was reduced to 8 per cent. We carry it now at 8 per cent.

Mr. MANN. I understand that. You had 6 per cent in the metal schedule bill last year, did you not?

Mr. PALMER. What, pig iron?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. Pig iron we had at 8 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman permit me one question? I understood him to say these ferro metals, these ferro substances, would come in under metals not enumerated. Would they not rather come in under the general provision at the end of the bill, section 7, I think it is—I do not remember now—that puts a duty of 10 per cent upon unmanufactured articles not enumerated?

Mr. PALMER. Under the present law? Oh, I think not.

Mr. PAYNE. Under the present law or under this bill.

Mr. PALMER. I do not pretend to construe the act, but I think, as I said before, that it would come in under the higher rate, but be that as it may, whether a reduction or not, we thought all alloys should bear the same rate.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 16, after the word "ferrosilicon," strike out "15 per cent ad valorem" and insert "\$2.50 per ton."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] permit me to ask him a question? Will the gentleman be willing to accept the amendment which I have offered?

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman will not.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman is cruel; usually he is not. He should not so rudely dash a hope which I so tremblingly entertained. I do not anticipate, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment will be adopted; if I did I would not vote for it myself [laughter], because I do not propose to take any part in running off on the public a bill which is feared by American industry and which, according to prophecy, can not long survive. I mean to leave the ship before it hits the rock. It is suggested to me by my constituent that the duty on this product, which is used in the manufacture of steel, ought to be fixed at a specific duty as in the present law at \$2.50 a ton, because the ad valorem duty of 15 per cent offered in the present bill will raise the duty on ferromanganese from \$2.50 a ton to \$8.70 per ton. I have no particular objection to the Democratic Party favoring ferromanganese with a duty of \$8.70 per ton, but I am wondering what my friend from Pennsylvania had in his mind when he raised the duty over the Republican mark. Ferromanganese can be produced in this country. There are furnaces that produce it, I am told. The Steel Corporation makes it for its own use, but the independents have to purchase it. Is it the purpose to encourage this industry? Is my constituent wrong when he figures that the duty upon this product has been raised from \$2.50 to \$8.70 per ton, based on the ad valorem duty? Can this be a Democratic protection? My constituent says this product sells at this time in the market for \$61 per ton. Mr. Chairman, as I have already said, I have no hope, of course, that this amendment will be adopted. It is not well drawn, but will do to vote down. Neither have I any hope that this bill will be defeated. I have had no opportunity to criticize it because there was nobody to listen to my criticism had I offered it. I came here regularly every day and heard gentlemen thunder in the cavern, greatly pleased with their own echoes. I have had no chance to present to this House, because there was no House, my views upon this bill, which I fear will bring trouble to all our people. I am not certain of it because I do not know, but I am anxious to live to a time that I may know. But I am thoroughly comforted when I recall the dictum of Mephistopheles found in Faust, "All that comes into being deserves to perish," and I believe this proposed law is enumerated in that list, and some day the torch of indignation will be applied to it and it will perish along with other Democratic extravagances. Mr. Chairman, I am not a pessimist, permit me to say; it is easy to be a pessimist and because of its ease we should guard ourselves against it—I do not criticize these gentlemen making this bill. The country will deal with them when the result of their performances is fully discovered. The responsibility is on them as they do the writing and the voting. That the business people are shocked and

terrified no one denies. They did not expect a free-trade law. Their protests are loud. They should have protested last November. Republicans can make no successful fight here.

The Democrats imagine they were commissioned, but they were not. A majority did not put them in power. Many of those who trusted them expected better of them. But they are sincere in their purpose, and we all wait to see what the effect of their written views will be. I said to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] yesterday, who was so skillfully explaining the chemical schedule, and who is an expert, as we all agree, upon it, that the Democrats steering this bill are treating us quite as well as we treated them on similar occasions. As I remember, we shot them in the squat. They permit us to run for our lives. They give us a chance to offer these amendments, so that they may have the pleasure of defeating them. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Did you shoot them on the impulse of the moment?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. This is the only real live chance I have had on this bill—it is to be short in time—the only time I have found Members in their seats. Why they are here I do not know. [Laughter.] When I see a Member of Congress in his seat I always imagine that he fears he is being watched by his constituency. [Applause and laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MOORE. I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] a question. I desire to speak, but first to ask the question.

Mr. BUTLER. Maybe I can not answer it.

Mr. MOORE. His amendment pertains to ferromanganese?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. I have listened to his statement, and I think his facts are confirmed by information that comes from constituents of mine. They tell the story so much better than I can that I shall read what they say:

Independent steel manufacturers are heavily handicapped by this increase, in view of the fact that the leading interest, the United States Steel Corporation, operates blast furnaces making ferromanganese in this country from imported ore, to be admitted free of duty. They are the only makers of ferromanganese in this country, the independent manufacturers importing the manufactured alloy, for which the present tariff bill imposes a duty of approximately \$8.70 a ton. The price of ferromanganese at several times has passed \$100 per ton. It has sold as high as \$150.

Instead of reducing duties for the relief of the consumer, therefore, it appears that in this instance the committee has actually raised the duty from \$2.50 a ton under the Payne bill to \$8.70 under the Underwood bill.

It has not yet been explained why the Democratic Party did this. They are pledged to enact a tariff law for the purpose of collecting revenue only. In this instance they seem to be operating in behalf of the United States Steel Corporation, presumably the greatest trust and combination in the world. This is the only concern that will get the advantage of the raise in the duty from \$2.50 provided in the Payne bill to \$8.70 as provided in the Underwood bill.

Mr. PAYNE. As I understand, the gentleman is protesting against the high protective tariff which the committee has put in this bill?

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for that question. While I am a protectionist, and wish to protect labor, I do not subscribe to the doctrine of protecting trusts and combinations, as they are protected in this bill in this particular instance. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I blush for my native State. [Applause on the Democratic side.] My colleague, the gentleman from the Chester-Delaware district [Mr. BUTLER], offers an amendment that is absolutely absurd upon its face, and my other distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Philadelphia [Mr. MOORE], rises to confirm everything that his mistaken colleague has said. He proposes an amendment which would strike out the rate of 15 per cent on these ferro alloys and substitute \$2.50 a ton. If it were put into the law it would be the laughing stock of the steel and iron industry of the country. This rate applies not alone to ferromanganese, but to every ferro alloy. The average unit of value of all ferro alloys is something over \$1,000 per ton, and the gentleman's amendment would have the effect of writing a rate into this bill on an average of two-tenths of 1 per cent. Now, if the gentleman means to put all this stuff on the free list, he ought to do it, but he ought not to fool anybody by an amendment of this character.

Now, as to ferromanganese, much has been said and much has been written to Members of Congress about this article. It is one of the two increases which this bill carries over the Payne bill in the steel and iron schedule, the other increase

being plated gold and silverware and gold and silverware. Each of them is increased for the same reason, purely and entirely as a revenue proposition. We want this bill to be recognized by the trade as a logical and symmetrical bill by which they can do business.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. PALMER. I can not yield. I have only five minutes.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who knows more about writing a tariff bill in a minute than my colleagues from Pennsylvania will know in all their lives, when he brought his bill into the House put ferromanganese in with the ferro alloys, just exactly as we have done, and he defended it, and he was right as a logical proposition. There was where it belonged. He was beaten in another part of this Capitol, because the iron and steel manufacturers of this country were able to bring pressure to bear upon the conferees and upon the other branch of this Congress, and reduced the tax upon this ferromanganese, and following the method that was then so popular in changing this law, instead of putting it there boldly and frankly and openly, and reducing the rate on ferromanganese, they hid it under pig iron at \$4 a ton and subsequently reduced that to \$2.50 a ton.

Now, I say we put it back in the ferro alloys class, where it belongs, because we want the steel and iron manufacturers to pay a share of the taxes to run this Government. It is purely for revenue purposes. It will not protect anybody and it will not seriously injure the consumer of steel and iron products. There is no ferromanganese made in the United States for sale. Absolutely the only manufacturer of ferromanganese in this country is the United States Steel Corporation, which makes it entirely for its own use. If it were in the market selling ferromanganese, perhaps there would be some force in the argument that we are doing something for its benefit.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I can not yield in five minutes. All the other manufacturers of steel and iron import their ferromanganese, and consequently, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] has said time and time again, playing no favorites, we say that all of these people who import this article ought to help pay the taxes to run the Government.

As I said before, it can not affect the consumer, because ferromanganese, like these other ferro alloys, is a medicine which is intended to give a peculiar character to certain kinds of steel, certain kinds of high-priced steel used in the manufacture of the finer forms of steel which, when they get to the consumer, are very much increased in value. There is 1 per cent of a ton of ferromanganese in a ton of steel. Even at the present high price of ferro of \$60 a ton there is therefore 60 cents worth of ferromanganese in a ton of steel, and at 15 per cent, which is this tariff, we levy a tariff upon the manufacturers of the country of 9 cents per ton of steel. And that is a kind of steel that goes into small tools and various things of that kind, which, as I said, when they get to the consumer, can not by any human ingenuity have this 9 cents a ton in the steel passed on.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] ought, I think, to be to strike out, in line 12 of this paragraph, the word "ferromanganese," with a statement that if that amendment should prevail the gentleman will offer an amendment at the end of the paragraph reading, "ferromanganese, \$2.50 per ton."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I can not yield in five minutes.

Mr. MOORE. I have the amendment right here.

Mr. MANN. Half a dozen gentlemen have the amendment.

Now, what is the situation? The United States Steel Corporation produces and uses about 120,000 tons of ferromanganese per year. They manufacture their own ferromanganese. Now, with the present rate of duty of \$2.50 per ton it is estimated that the rate of duty of 15 per cent, as provided in this bill, will raise the duty to the neighborhood of \$7 or \$8 or \$9 per ton. All of the independent steel manufacturers buy imported ferromanganese now. They are in competition with the United States Steel Corporation. There is nearly as much ferromanganese used by the independent steel manufacturers, imported from abroad at \$2.50 per ton duty, as there is used by the United States Steel Corporation, manufactured by itself.

Now, the proposition is to increase the rate of duty on this article, necessary in the production of steel, from \$2.50 per ton to \$8 per ton and to give that much of a handicap against the independent manufacturer and in favor of the United States Steel Corporation. These independent steel manufacturers today can not afford to manufacture ferromanganese, and the United States Steel Corporation now can afford to manufacture ferromanganese.

There can be only one of two purposes in the proposition to increase the rate of duty. One is a protective purpose, to encourage a manufacturing establishment in this country which will manufacture ferromanganese for the use of the independent steel manufacturers. The other—if it is not a protective measure for them—is purely in the interest of the United States Steel Corporation. What do we find in this bill? The very articles into which ferromanganese goes have the duty decreased by the bill, tending to increase the foreign competition, and while they are decreasing the rate on the finished products they are adding to the rate on the raw material which we must import from abroad. That is cutting both ends. That is playing both ends against the middle.

I am a protectionist. If the purpose of this measure were, within reasonable limitations, to build up an industry here which would manufacture ferromanganese at reasonable rates, where there could be competition, I would favor it.

But that is not the purpose, and probably that will not be the effect. The effect of that increase is simply to add to the profits of the United States Steel Corporation and increase their power in competition with the independent manufacturers. It ought to be the policy of our country at this time to give aid to those who are independently competing with the great combinations of capital and the great organizations which seek to monopolize the markets, rather than, as this proposes to do, give aid and comfort to the monopolies against the independent competitors. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I desire to insert as a part of my remarks the following letters:

AMERICAN STEEL FOUNDRIES,
Chicago, April 24, 1913.

HON. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MANN: There is a curious inconsistency in the proposed new tariff law, Schedule C, clause 106, which it is very difficult to understand—in fact, I have not found anyone who could explain it. It is proposed to change the duty on ferromanganese from \$2.50 per ton to 15 per cent ad valorem. This means on the present market price abroad, say, \$58 a ton, that the duty would be at the rate of \$8.70 a ton—a net increase of \$6.20.

There is only one producer of ferromanganese in this country and that is the Carnegie Steel Co., and all of its product goes to the Steel Corporation. They produced in 1911 123,000 tons; in 1912, 121,000 tons.

All of the independent steel manufacturers, steel foundries, and others import their ferromanganese. In taking off the tariff on fabricated steel and iron manufacturers in this country are thrown into direct competition with foreign manufacturers, under the most unfavorable conditions as to labor cost, and why, in addition to this, it is now proposed to radically increase the duty on the one element that must go into every ton of steel and that must be imported, it is difficult to understand.

If the answer is made that this high duty will encourage the domestic manufacture of ferromanganese, the reply is that it at once becomes a highly protected form of industry, which, as we understand it, is just the thing that the present law proposes to avoid. The tonnage of ferromanganese imported annually is generally estimated at about 125,000 tons, so that the income from the duty is a comparatively insignificant item and it would hardly seem that this could be urged as a reason for the serious increase.

I think the whole thing has come about through a misunderstanding as to what ferromanganese really is. In the bill it is put under the same heading as to duty as chromium, titanium, tungsten, etc. As a matter of fact, ferromanganese is simply pig iron with a high percentage of manganese. It is an absolutely necessary constituent of every ton of steel that is made, whereas the other alloys are added to an extremely small percentage of steel that is required for special purposes, such as making tools, etc.

Aside from the unnecessary increase in the cost of all steel made in this country, this increase in the duty on ferromanganese seems so uncalled for and inconsistent that it should not be allowed to go through. I trust you will find it consistent to do what you can to get the thing straightened out.

Very truly, yours,

R. P. LAMONT, President.

ROGERS, BROWN & CO.,
Chicago, April 21, 1913.

HON. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are writing to you as our Representative in Congress, to ask that you use your influence in the matter of whatever duty is established for ferromanganese to have it a specific instead of an ad valorem duty. The bill now under consideration in the House provides for a "15 per cent ad valorem." The present duty is specific, being \$2.50 per ton, having been reduced from \$4 per ton by the tariff act of August 5, 1909.

A 15 per cent ad valorem is a very heavy increase over the existing rate, too large, in our opinion, and, as you no doubt know, rests lightly on one and bears heavily on the shoulders of all other steel manufacturers.

The difficulty with the ad valorem duty is the confusion which arises from that form of assessment, making it almost impossible for a buyer when he places his order to know what the stuff will cost him when it is finally delivered, if we are correct in understanding that the duty is assessed on the market value at the time of the arrival of the material in this country or time of shipment from abroad.

We respectfully urge you also to use your influence for maintaining the duty on pig iron where it is. It has been very heavily reduced in recent tariff acts and has now a very low duty. Recently there have been developed in China and India large iron works, built by American engineers on American models for Chinese and Indian ownership, which are manufacturing pig iron at a very much lower cost than is possible at any point in the United States. We understand American-made pig iron is being supplanted to a considerable extent on the Pacific coast,

and as these institutions grow American manufacturers may expect to have to surrender all of that trade to foreign-made iron and face the possibility of the eastern seaboard being eventually thus invaded. From Asia the danger of competition in future is more serious than anything we may expect from Europe.

Yours, truly,

ROGERS, BROWN & CO.

PRIMOS, DELAWARE COUNTY, PA., March 29, 1913.

HON. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We respectfully call your attention to the inclosed short supplementary brief stating our positions referring to proposed tariff changes asking for tariff for revenue only.

We earnestly request your support in this matter.

Respectfully, yours,

PRIMOS CHEMICAL CO.,
WALTER M. STEIN, President.

PRIMOS, DELAWARE COUNTY, PA., March 25, 1913.

HON. OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD,
Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In accordance with the announcement of the Committee on Ways and Means, dated December 11, 1912, and in compliance with the suggestions contained therein, we beg to submit herewith our brief and to outline herein the information desired by the committee.

Name of company: Primos Chemical Co.
Location of works: Primos, Delaware County, Pa.; Newmire, San Miguel County, Colo.; Lakewood, Boulder County, Colo. (the Primos Mining & Milling Co., a separate corporation).
Sales offices: Primos, Delaware County, Pa.
Nature of business: Manufacture of metals and alloys.
Principal metals and alloys manufactured: Tungsten metal, ferrotungsten, molybdenum metal, ferromolybdenum, ferrovanadium.
Subject: Paragraph 184 of the tariff law of 1909.

SCHEDULE C.

In addition to brief submitted January 8, 1913, we give you the following facts:

Importations of tungsten ore.

(1912. Tons of 2,205 pounds. Duty, 10 per cent ad valorem.)

First quarter	194.0 tons, \$94,980; duty, \$9,498.00	\$104,478.00
Second quarter	137.0 tons, 67,272; duty, 6,727.20	73,999.20
Third quarter	218.8 tons, 104,814; duty, 10,481.40	115,295.40
Fourth quarter	184.0 tons, 95,356; duty, 9,535.60	104,891.60
	733.8 tons, 362,422; duty, 36,242.20	398,664.20

During the year 1912 the two mills of the Primos Mining & Milling Co., as well as the mills of other producers of tungsten ore in the United States, had to shut down for about five months, as it was impossible to compete with foreign ores, due to the high rate of wages paid in the mining districts of the United States, and the eight-hour working day.

Total ore importations, 806.74 net tons during the year 1912.
Total production of the Primos Mining & Milling Co., of Colorado, largest producer in the United States, for the entire year, 204 tons.

Importations of tungsten metal and ferrotungsten, 1912.

(Ton of 2,205 pounds. Duty, 20 per cent ad valorem.)

First quarter	41.01 tons, \$40,679.00	Duty, \$8,135.80
Second quarter	39.50 tons, 46,567.00	Duty, 9,313.40
Third quarter	83.39 tons, 88,150.00	Duty, 19,630.00
Fourth quarter	124.00 tons, 138,476.00	Duty, 27,695.20
	287.81 tons, 323,872.00	Duty, 64,774.40

Per pound, 61.38 cents with duty; per pound, 51.15 cents without duty; 287.81 tons of 2,205 pounds, or 317.31 short tons of 2,000 pounds, or 634,621 pounds.

Besides ourselves, there are two other producers of metal whose total production altogether is probably not over 50,000 pounds for the entire year. Our production of tungsten metal for 1912 amounted to 625,600 pounds.

As explained before the various tariff boards, 20 per cent duty on tungsten metal or ferrotungsten is not protective, but is now on a basis of tariff for revenue only.

Wrong classification: Tungsten metal, ferrotungsten, molybdenum metal, ferromolybdenum, and ferrovanadium manufacture is a chemical-metallurgical problem, not a purely smelting proposition. Everything used in the manufacture in the nature of chemicals, other materials, and electric power is very much higher in this country than in Europe, and the wages of labor, skilled chemists, and mechanics employed are from two to three times those paid in Germany and other competing countries on similar products exported to this country. The ever-increasing imports are the best proof that the present duties of 20 per cent on metal and 10 per cent on ore are not sufficient. A 35 per cent duty on metals and alloys would not be prohibitive, but would be on a basis of tariff for revenue only. The imports will remain substantially the same as at present and the revenue to the Government will be increased without injury to the consumer, the advantage to the producer arising entirely from the increase in consumption, because the domestic consumer will be able to get his alloys in the United States without being dependent upon foreign syndicates, which will be the case if the American producer is driven out of business by a lowering of the tariff rate.

We therefore most earnestly request that the present rates be not lowered but raised to the basis of the tariff for revenue principle.

In closing we would earnestly invite the attention of your committee to the evidence given by our president at the hearings before the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate, Sixty-second Congress, of H. R. 18642 ("Duties on metals and manufactures of metals"), February 15, 1912, and to the brief submitted by us on January 8, 1913.

Respectfully submitted,

PRIMOS CHEMICAL CO.,
WALTER M. STEIN, President.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment. I make the modification upon the sug-

gestion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], because I think it is more likely to be adopted. Therefore I ask to modify my amendment by moving to strike out, in line 12, the word "ferromanganese," it being understood that if this amendment prevails I will then offer an amendment to put ferromanganese on the list at \$2.50. I may, however, be saved the trouble of offering that amendment. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment by striking out in line 12, the word "ferromanganese," with the statement that if that amendment prevails he will then offer the amendment indicated at the end of the paragraph.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if we strike out the word "ferromanganese" here and then your amendment offered later is voted down, what becomes of the duty on ferromanganese?

Mr. BUTLER. It will remain where it is now.

Mr. MANN. It will go in the basket clause.

Mr. MURDOCK. What rate does the basket clause carry?

Mr. MANN. I think it carries the same amount.

Mr. BUTLER. If it is stricken out and the other amendment is not agreed to, then it will go into the basket clause, but I have not anticipated that it would be stricken out. I have not thought that far ahead.

Mr. MANN. The probability is that if there are votes enough to strike it out here there are votes enough to put it back.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as modified.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER offers the following amendment by way of a new paragraph:

"104j. Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, and the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites, 15 cents per ton: *Provided*, That in levying and collecting the duty on iron ore no deduction shall be made from the weight of the ore on account of moisture which may be chemically or physically combined therewith."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, this is not an entirely new subject. It has been before this House on two or three different occasions during the past four years, and has been voted upon.

I do not expect, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will be adopted, sharing as I do the views of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] of the impenetrability of the phalanx on the other side of the aisle; but I do want the membership of this House to know what they are doing when they vote for the paragraph just voted upon and when they vote upon this amendment which I have just offered.

Never since this Government was established has it been proposed to put iron ore on the free list until about four years ago. There have always been excellent reasons why a duty should be placed on iron ore, but there never was a time when those reasons were so forceful and so strong as they are to-day. There are several iron-ore producing sections of this country. The county in which I live produced last year 30,000,000 tons of iron ore. The total production in the United States was 49,000,000 tons. The producing areas may be called the Lake Superior district, which is the largest; the Tennessee-Alabama district; and a small one located in the State of New York. The inquiry readily follows, Whence will the competition come? In recent years large ore deposits have been found in various parts of the world, which affect the iron situation in America. The two principal areas from which iron ore will come to America are Sweden and Finland and Cuba. The ore from the Sweden-Finland district need not be particularly feared, but that from Cuba presents a grave situation. These Cuban iron-ore deposits are of very great extent and exceptional accessibility. Those iron ores are to-day coming into the United States at 12 cents per ton, and those from Sweden are coming in at 15 cents per ton, and they have driven the iron ores of this country entirely west of the Appalachian range. The extreme low wage scale in Cuba and low freight rate to America enable these Cuban ores already to drive American ore west of the mountains, and soon they will capture Pittsburgh, the great ore mart of the world. Last year there were imported about 2,000,000 tons, which paid \$300,000 in revenue. This bill proposes to take away that \$300,000 from the Treasury of the United States and give it to the Pennsylvania Steel Co. And what is the Pennsylvania Steel Co.? It is the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

The Commissioner of Corporations, reporting upon this subject but a few months ago, said that the Pennsylvania Steel

Co. is controlled by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., and has acquired by purchase the Spanish-American iron ore deposits of Cuba. When this bill becomes a law the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., together with Charles M. Schwab, will be beneficiary to the extent of \$300,000 annually. Adopt this amendment and that \$300,000 each year will be put into the pockets of the American people and kept from the pockets of the greatest railroad company on earth and one of the iron magnates of the world.

In harmony with the paragraph just voted upon I beg to call attention to another phase of this paragraph.

Our good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], able as he always is, informed us that ferromanganese is in the nature of a medicine to go into the production of steel products, and would be a tax on the iron and steel manufacturers and not increase the price to the consumers. I think he is right. He followed by saying that he proposed to increase the tax 350 per cent for the purpose of making the companies pay more into the Treasury. I looked at the figures in the tables submitted by the Ways and Means Committee, and I find that in 1910 under the Payne bill there was imported into the United States \$4,000,000 worth of ferromanganese, paying a duty of \$284,000, and these estimates furnished by his own committee tell us they expect to import \$550,000 worth of the product each year and pay a tax of \$82,000. When in time have men been able to figure to show that it is? This prohibitive duty will cut importations from \$4,000,000 to \$550,000; reduce revenue from \$284,000 to \$82,000 each year. There will thus be taken again from Uncle Sam's pocket \$200,000 each year, and where will it go? We are told the only manufacturer of ferromanganese in the United States is the United States Steel Corporation; therefore the people of the country have taken from their pockets each year \$200,000 to increase the profits of the Steel Corporation. Free iron ore and a prohibitive duty on ferromanganese combined will take from the people's pockets \$500,000 each year and no one will be benefited but the manufacturers of iron and steel. How any Democrat can profess what they all do and vote for such a schedule as this surpasses the imagination of man. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, referring first to the last proposition which my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] has mentioned, the loss of revenue to the Government, I want to say that he is clearly mistaken, as he must see if he examines closely into the figures. The imports of ferromanganese last year were in the neighborhood of 75,000 tons. Fifteen per cent upon the value of that will very largely exceed the present duty on iron ore under last year's importations. The duties on iron ore amounted to \$263,000. The reason the estimates were printed as the gentleman has read was doubtless because of the fact that the new price in ferromanganese was not taken into consideration in writing that estimate, the estimate being based on the old price.

Mr. MILLER. Are the estimates wrong?

Mr. PALMER. The estimate was based on the former price when the Underwood bill was written last year.

Mr. MILLER. Has the price been changed within a week?

Mr. PALMER. I have stated the facts. Now to return to iron ore. The gentlemen on the other side complain that we are punishing the independent steel and iron manufacturers by putting manganese at a higher rate and voting against that punishment; and then they come forward with a proposition to punish the same people, the independent steel and iron manufacturers, by retaining the duty on iron ore. The great benefit growing out of the reduction of this tax on iron ore will go to the independent steel and iron manufacturers of the country. The United States Steel Corporation owns or controls not only all the ore which it uses, but a very large part of the merchantable ore which is available for consumption in the United States. The independent manufacturer is forced either to get upon his knees and go to the Steel Corporation for ore or find a new field in a foreign market, and most of them have endeavored to find iron ore abroad. The Bethlehem people, the Pennsylvania people, the Cambria people, the manufacturers in the district represented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], have gone into Cuba and into South America after ore. This reduction from 12 cents on Cuban ore and 15 cents, as far as South American ore is concerned, will of course make it easier for them to compete against the concern which not only owns all the ore it uses, as in the case of ferromanganese, but has a pretty tight grip on the ore that anybody can use or get.

My friend from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], of course, preaches the true Republican doctrine, when he comes here trying to protect the interest which is chiefest in his district, yet four years

ago, when the Republican whip cracked over his head, he voted for free iron ore.

Mr. MILLER. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not.

Mr. PALMER. Did not the gentleman vote for the Payne bill in the House?

Mr. MILLER. I did not; I voted against it.

Mr. PALMER. I thought the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Austin] was the only Republican who voted against the Payne law in the House, and I think that is right.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman can consult the Record, and he will find that I did not, although I am not particularly proud of it.

Mr. PALMER. Of course, I take the gentleman's statement for it. If he did not vote for the bill, I withdraw my statement; but all the rest of the Members on that side of the House who now propose to vote for this tax on iron ore except the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Austin] four years ago voted with the gentleman from New York [Mr. Payne] and put iron ore on the free list. The gentleman from Tennessee is really in an admirable position. Iron ore has been his hobby, and he is going to be able to say when he gets back home to the cross-roads of Tennessee that he, too, has been upon both sides of this proposition. [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have not been on both sides of this proposition.

Mr. PALMER. I will convince the gentleman right now that he has.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well; proceed.

Mr. PALMER. He did vote against the Payne bill in the House, but he voted for the conference report that put the Payne law on the statute book and reduced the duty on iron ore from 40 cents a ton to 12 cents, and now he gags at taking 12 cents more. Then he was willing to take a reduction of 28 cents a ton for iron ore, and voted for it. He can go back and tell his people that he would not vote for a reduction on iron ore for the benefit of independent manufacturers when it came up in a Democratic House, but he can turn the other way and tell the manufacturers of his district or his State that when the Payne bill came up he did vote for a reduction for them.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Palmer] says that the increase on the duty on ferromanganese is intended as a revenue proposition. Yesterday we learned from the gentleman from New York [Mr. Harrison], who was in charge of the chemical schedule bill, that the report was not to be considered as reliable. Whenever a controverted proposition came up, and we appealed to the figures in the report of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Harrison] said that those figures were not reliable, and now, when we meet the metal schedule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Palmer] representing that schedule on the floor, says the same thing about it.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I can not in five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. I will really take only 15 seconds of the gentleman's time to correct his statement.

Mr. MANN. I did not interrupt the gentleman, but I will yield if he will be brief.

Mr. PALMER. All I want to say is this, and the gentleman ought to know it: The present price of ferromanganese is \$60 a ton, and upon that price there will be a large increase. The reason these figures are as the gentleman states is because the officials of the department took last year's average price, which is very much lower.

Mr. MANN. Let us see whether that is correct or not. The average price stated in this report for ferromanganese under the Wilson tariff was \$24 a ton, under the Dingley tariff \$32 a ton, and under the Payne tariff \$37 a ton, and last year it was \$37 a ton.

Mr. PALMER. That is what I said.

Mr. MANN. No; that is not what the gentleman said. He said the price had been reduced from \$60 to \$37 a ton, when the report of the committee shows that all the time \$37 is the highest rate.

The report shows that last year ferromanganese was imported to the extent of \$2,821,000, and that it paid a duty of \$190,000, and that a proposition to increase the rate for revenue purposes will import \$550,000 worth, less than one-fifth of the amount now imported. On that the revenue will be \$82,500, less than one-half that now paid. Figures! Every time the question comes up the gentleman repudiates the figures in the report.

What is the situation? Ferromanganese is used by all the independent steel manufacturers, including those in the West.

I have several in my district, independent as well as the United States Steel Corporation. It is proposed to increase the rate on ferromanganese which these independent manufacturers in the West and elsewhere must use and at the same time reduce the rate on iron ore, which is imported from abroad exclusively for the use of the steel manufacturers on the Atlantic coast. The chief one of which is in the district represented by the distinguished gentleman who wrote the metal-schedule bill.

And if that does not reflect him for life I do not know what will.

Mr. PALMER. It will.

Mr. MANN. But that is the situation. He said a moment ago that he was taking off the tariff for the benefit of the independent manufacturers of iron ore and putting it as a revenue measure on ferromanganese. What is the fact? The western manufacturers will pay the increased tax on ferromanganese, and the reduction which the gentleman makes is exclusively for the benefit of the steel manufacturers in that portion of the country from which the gentleman himself comes. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I do not charge a purpose of favoring the great Steel Trust of this country, but I am satisfied if the Members of this House read the statements at the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee of the great independent concerns that they will be convinced that there is discrimination in favor of the United States Steel Co., the so-called Steel Trust, and that there is additional punishment for the independents. I will quote from the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Palmer] to prove the additional punishment. In the discussion of this subject the other day Mr. AUSTIN, of Tennessee, stated:

Mr. AUSTIN. I am asking you if the record does not show what I have stated, and that the remission or the placing of iron ore on the free list benefits the steel corporation in your district to the extent of \$42,000 a year on importation of Swedish iron ore alone, taking that amount of money out of the Treasury and turning it over to the Bethlehem Steel Co.?

Mr. PALMER. No; that is not an accurate statement. I go as far as the truth will permit any man to go when I say that iron ore is imported by the Bethlehem Steel Co. and that we have put iron ore on the free list. But iron ore is imported by many other independent steel or iron makers of the country besides the Bethlehem Steel Co., and the gentleman knows that. And I will say another thing to the gentleman, that the Bethlehem Steel Co. are large producers of the kind of steel which takes ferromanganese, and that company will pay a higher tax on its ferromanganese by reason of the change in this law than it will save by the putting of iron ore on the free list.

Mr. PALMER. I expect the gentleman is reading that for the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Mann].

Mr. MANN. No; he is reading it to have the gentleman repudiate it.

Mr. FARR. On page 1021 of the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, the representative of the great Republic Iron & Steel Co. said:

There is only one concern in this country that is a large enough user of ferromanganese to avail itself of this privilege, viz, the United States Steel Corporation. The amount of ferromanganese used varies from 25 to 50 pounds per ton of steel. A concern that produces 20,000,000 tons of steel ingots could operate a blast furnace or two on ferromanganese. A concern producing a million tons of steel, as we do, could not afford to operate a blast furnace on ferromanganese, because our consumption per annum would not be sufficient to feed a furnace. There are no two other manufacturers that I know of who are big enough to operate a blast furnace for their own supply of ferromanganese.

The great Lackawanna Steel Co., of Buffalo, also objects, as do all the independents who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, to this increase in ferromanganese, stating it is directly for the benefit of the United States Steel Co. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made the statement upon this floor the other day admitting that the United States Steel Co. was the only producer of ferromanganese in the country, but he said it did not sell any. Now, I ask the gentleman if he is convinced of the truthfulness of that statement to-day?

Mr. PALMER. That has been my information at all times.

Mr. FARR. Well, the information is virtually to the effect that the company either by barter or for cash furnishes other concerns of this country with ferromanganese, and I desire to submit with this additional tariff on ferromanganese if the Steel Trust will not have an additional advantage over great independent concerns that are fighting for their livelihood to-day.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman permit me to say, does not this tend to very greatly increase the value of ferromanganese to the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. FARR. Certainly, it does; and the United States Steel Co. are the only ones in this country who are producing it.

Mr. BUTLER. It raises the value of it.

Mr. FARR. I submit, not for the purpose of being heard in this House, but to suggest to gentlemen on that side, that here is one schedule that you have not thoroughly or in any way scientifically considered. I do not charge the Ways and

Means Committee with the purpose of affording any advantage to the Steel Trust, but it certainly does so in this paragraph.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARR. I do.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman says that ferromanganese is controlled wholly by the trust.

Mr. FARR. By the United States Steel Co., according to the word of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who is sponsor for the metal schedule; he admits the fact and says they are the only people in this country who are making it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Why does not the gentleman suggest to the Democratic Party that the Democratic platform pledges that party to put all trust-controlled products on the free list?

Mr. FARR. It is a trust-made article on the dutiable list. You are going to injure the independents. You are going to give them an additional opportunity to crush them. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] made the assertion on the floor the other day that because of the world-wide trust in the matter of steel rails there would not be any reduction in the cost of steel rails to the users in this country, notwithstanding steel rails in this measure are on the free list. In the statement I believe the gentleman is right. The placing of steel rails on the free list will be another advantage to the United States Steel Co., which, it is believed, is a part of the world-wide trust, and a further disadvantage to the independents in their efforts to compete with the United States Steel Co.

But there is, to my mind, danger in free importations of steel rails. It may be imaginary, but it can be real and exceedingly hurtful. The United States Steel Co., it is contended and believed, is a part of the world-wide Steel Trust. The American independent manufacturers are not. Wages abroad in steel making is half, in many instances less than half, what is paid to workmen in that industry in this country. Suppose we have labor troubles in a mill of the United States Steel Co.? Would not this world-wide trust, through the mutual sympathy that goes with it, be a danger factor? Or for any other reason that might appeal to this great steel company, what would prevent them from shutting up a mill in this country and importing their rails from England, Germany, Belgium, or any other foreign country where the trust understanding exists?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is recognized.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] stated that I could go back to the iron manufacturers in my district in reference to the duty in the Payne bill on pig iron. I will say that he can go to Bethlehem, Pa., and tell Mr. Schwab that he can get in his foreign iron ore free. Mr. Schwab was in Washington four years ago to obtain from a Republican Ways and Means Committee free iron ore. In one of the New York papers some time ago he said that he had made a contract to secure from Sweden 25,000,000 tons of iron ore. If you reduce the duty on iron ore and put it on the free list, and he imports 25,000,000 tons of it from Sweden, then you have saved for the man who has always opposed your election to Congress more than \$4,700,000 of tariff duty. Mr. Schwab ought to give our distinguished colleague a gold medal and aid in keeping him in Congress as long as he lives.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Schwab testified before the committee that the Bethlehem Steel Works, he, and Mr. Carnegie, own all the iron ore mines that have been so far discovered in Cuba.

Mr. AUSTIN. Last year we imported from Cuba 1,200,000 tons of iron ore. Mr. Schwab not only buys iron ore in Cuba, where he has purchased large holdings and constructed wharves and railroads, but he is a large importer of iron ore from Sweden.

Now, in the United States we pay \$2.48 per day to men who mine iron. In Cuba they pay \$1 a day; Spain, where women are employed, pays 50 cents to \$1 a day; Sweden, 75 cents to \$1 a day. In Chile, where Mr. Schwab has recently secured large deposits of iron ore, which it is proposed to import free, the labor cost is from 50 cents to \$1 a day.

Now, the gentleman speaks about the United States Steel Corporation controlling all the iron ore in this country. There are nine iron furnaces in eastern Tennessee that are not controlled by the United States Steel Corporation, that own their own ore lands, and they are shipping their pig iron to Pennsylvania; and in the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee Mr. PALMER learned for the first time that southern furnaces were selling from 15,000 to 20,000 tons of pig iron per month on the Delaware River. I oppose free iron ore because it is a strike at the great pig-iron industry of the South, now producing over 3,000,000 tons per annum. The South is compelled to sell its out-

put not in the South but in the Mississippi Valley and along the Atlantic coast and in the New England cities as far up as Boston, and if you give this advantage—free iron ore—to the Pennsylvania Steel Co., which owns also the Maryland Steel Co. and the Bethlehem Steel Co., you will have robbed the southern iron furnaces of the difference in the cost of laying down pig iron in the East in competition with the companies who own the iron-ore lands in Cuba and which are importing iron ore from Spain and Sweden.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] said, as I understood him, that the Steel Trust controlled practically all the iron-ore bodies in this country. The Republic Co., which is the principal independent company of this country, has 21 mines alone.

Mr. AUSTIN. I want to say, in reference to that, that if his statement was true that the United States Steel Corporation owned all the iron-ore lands in this country, would it not be for the benefit of the American wage earner in this country to buy all of that ore, to mine it in this country, and keep the money here, keep our men in the iron-ore mines of Alabama, New York, Michigan, Tennessee, and Minnesota employed, rather than to give employment to foreigners who work in the mines of Cuba, Spain, and Sweden?

What else do we do? According to the official records, we take out of the Treasury now about \$300,000 in revenue and present that to the two great steel corporations, the Bethlehem Steel Co. and the Pennsylvania Steel Co. We present that to them, and as the result of it they will save from 30 to 45 cents a ton on the manufacture of pig iron, and with that advantage they will injure the sale of southern pig iron that is now shipped to the East on a freight charge of \$4.20 a ton.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to the eloquent appeal of my friend from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] for my constituents, because they are more involved in this question than are the gentleman's constituents. We have in the district I have the honor to represent a very much larger supply of iron ore than has the district represented by the gentleman from Tennessee, and probably the largest supply next to that of the district represented by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] who has spoken. On the other hand, we buy our ferromanganese.

Now, as a practical question, the appeal of the gentleman from Tennessee to keep this tax on iron ore is just exactly the same appeal that the citrus fruit men of California made to your side of the House four years ago—to raise the price on lemons in order to equalize freight rates to the eastern seaboard. That is all your argument means. You want us to keep a tax on iron ore in order that we may progress a little further into somebody else's territory and take care of freight rates.

Now, as a practical question it is not 30 or 45 cents a ton difference. Most of this iron ore comes from Cuba, and under the treaty the rate is 12 cents per ton from Cuba, which makes the rate on that iron ore used in a ton of pig iron about 24 cents, so that the actual benefit they get is 24 cents a ton; no more and no less.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is greater on Swedish ore and Spanish ore.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Very little Swedish ore comes in. There was formerly some Spanish ore that came in.

What is the practical question on this iron ore? Before the Payne bill was passed the duty on iron ore was 45 cents a ton. That duty was reduced under that bill to 15 cents a ton, and as it comes from Cuba it means 12 cents a ton. Now, up to the time the Payne bill became a law—which my friend voted for when the conference report came here—the producer of iron ore in the district of the gentleman from Minnesota and in the Wisconsin districts penetrated to the eastern seaboard. None now penetrates to the eastern seaboard. It came there under the 45 per cent duty. But when you reduced the tax to 12 cents from Cuba, then the freight rate intervened, and it was cheaper for the men on the eastern seaboard to buy it from Cuba than to buy it from Minnesota; and, as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] said, you drew the line as to how far east the western ores could come at the Allegheny Mountains. Now, if you take off this 12 cents duty the freight rate with the 12 per cent off will stop the iron ore at the Allegheny Mountains.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not yield. I have only five minutes, and I want to finish. You are going to stop it there anyhow. The line of demarcation will be there under this bill, at the Allegheny Range, with free ore, just as it is to-day under the Payne bill with 15 cents on ore.

But there is another reason why this ore should be placed on the free list, and it is not going to affect the production in the gentleman's district. It is this: We have greatly reduced the tax on pig iron. The competitive point on pig iron is the eastern seaboard, where water transportation brings the foreign iron into competition with the domestic iron. There is no danger of competition with the furnaces of the gentleman's district, or of mine, or with the furnaces west of the Allegheny Mountains, because the \$2.50 freight rate on pig iron shuts out the foreign product. The real point of competition is at the water front, and we have reduced the rate on pig iron. We have brought them down to a competitive rate, and whether it is your constituents or mine, representing all the people of the United States it is nothing but right that we should do justice to these blast-iron furnaces on the seaboard, and inasmuch as we have cut their rate to a competitive point, we should give them an open door so that they might have freer ore for their own territory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, just a word.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Did it not come out in the testimony that the Alabama furnaces sold from 15,000 tons to 20,000 tons of pig iron in Pennsylvania, on the Delaware River, and that their sales extended to New Jersey, Delaware, New England, New York City, Brooklyn, northern New Jersey, and Newark?

Mr. FORDNEY. That is my recollection; but I am not positive about the figures. But the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] now states that because of their lowering the duty on pig iron and putting iron ore upon the free list they have brought the products of this country on a competitive basis with foreign competitive products.

It will be remembered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that Mr. Gary, president of the United States Steel Corporation, testified before the Ways and Means Committee four years ago. When the question was put to him, "Can you produce pig iron and continue to manufacture steel in this country under free trade?" his answer was in the affirmative. He said, "There are some gentlemen in this room who will bear out my statement that by putting iron ore, pig iron, and steel on the free list you will drive out of existence the independent steel manufacturers in this country. Why? Because the United States Steel Corporation, that produces 44 per cent of all the steel produced in this country, can live under free trade when the independents must go out of business." The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee asked why that was. He asked, "Is your machinery more modern or more efficient? Have you greater experts in the manufacture of steel than have the independents?" Mr. Gary replied that the independent manufacturers of steel in this country purchased their pig iron from the United States Steel Corporation, and that there was no other pig iron produced in this country for them to purchase, and that the United States Steel Corporation made a profit of \$2 per ton on that pig iron when selling it to the independent manufacturers, and that if worst came to worst that \$2 per ton on their pig iron would be a profit to the Steel Corporation and the independents would be compelled to go out of business.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] corrects me when I say that Mr. Schwab testified that the Bethlehem Steel Co. owned all the iron mines in Cuba. He states that practically all the iron mines in Cuba were owned by them, as stated by Mr. Schwab. I accept the correction, but it is my recollection that Mr. Schwab said that the Bethlehem Steel Co., or he and Mr. Carnegie, owned all the iron mines in Cuba that had been discovered that were valuable, and that the iron ore produced in Cuba was much superior to the iron ore produced in this country in one certain respect—for the manufacture of open-hearth steel. To the iron ore mined in this country a certain amount of nickel must be added in the steel, but the ore from Cuba contains a sufficient amount of nickel, so that it is unnecessary that in the production of open-hearth steel made from Cuban ore any nickel be added.

But there is another disadvantage to the Cuban ore—that it contains a greater amount of moisture than the ore of the United States—but Mr. Schwab said he thought that in the near future some method of extracting that moisture economically would be discovered, and that in the near future Cuban ore would be much more valuable to the manufacturer of iron than the ore of this country. Therefore, gentlemen, in placing

iron ore on the free list and bringing the manufacturer of pig iron in this country on a competitive basis with the foreigner there is no question in my mind that, without any intention of being unfair, you have erred in your judgment and you have thrown all the benefits to be derived to one concern in the United States—the United States Steel Corporation.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that at the end of five minutes the debate on this paragraph and amendments may be closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that at the end of five minutes the debate on this paragraph and amendments shall be considered concluded. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will withdraw the request at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to take any part in the debate on this subject. I did not think the House would want to hear from the stand-stiller who cut the duty on pig iron from \$4 to \$2.50 a ton and made as big a cut as this committee have made, because they have only cut in two the duty of \$2.50, according to the equivalent ad valorem.

I did report a bill putting iron ore on the free list. What was the condition? The United States Steel Corporation had tried to get all the iron ore in sight up in Minnesota. They had made their contracts with Mr. Hill, which covered all his holdings and the interests with which he was allied up there, at a rate for the iron ore that was progressive and would have increased the price from year to year if it had not been interfered with, so that perhaps it would have satisfied my friend from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] on the iron ore there and my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] on the iron ore up in that State. I thought that if we put iron ore on the free list it would help break up that little arrangement.

Although I have never made any progress, according to the ideas of some gentlemen, I did more to break up that monopoly on the part of the United States Steel Co. than appears anywhere in this bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I want to suggest to the gentleman from New York that since that time the Hill leases have been canceled.

Mr. PAYNE. I was just about to say that they had been canceled; and why? Because of free iron ore, or iron ore at 12 cents a ton, which is pretty nearly free. They had to cancel the leases; they had to get out of it. They did not have a monopoly of sending the iron ore east of the Allegheny Mountains. It so happened that most of the independent manufacturers of iron and steel were east of the Alleghenies. While some of them were large concerns some were small, and they were making nearly 60 per cent of the production.

I acknowledge freely that I wanted to encourage them, or at least I did not want to turn or keep back the whole thing into the hands of the United States Steel Co. and leave these people at their mercy. I made what investigation I could, and I became satisfied that free iron ore would not hurt any iron mines in the United States except possibly those in the State of New York. I examined into that question pretty closely, because these were large interests, employing a good many people and turning out a good deal of ore. I became satisfied that they could stand free iron ore without injury to their business, largely because they had to have other ore to mingle with theirs in order to manufacture pig iron, and the only place they could get it from was the western mines, or else from Cuba or Nova Scotia.

The gentleman from Michigan misunderstood my reply a few minutes ago. I told him that while Charles M. Schwab said that he had an option or agreement, or had purchased a large quantity of ore in Cuba, that he did not claim that he had all of it. It was then undeveloped, and he frankly stated that he thought it was going to be a success. He did speak of moisture, but thought he could overcome that. Nobody that has come in contact with Mr. Schwab, who seems to make a very fair statement, and I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania will agree with me—I say nobody will deny that he has an engaging personality, and he certainly knows as much about the iron and steel industry as any man I ever met.

Mr. PALMER. He has engaged me in an interesting conflict several times. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state in the interest of accuracy that the United States Steel Corporation not only does not control all the iron ore in this country, but it does not control anything like one-half of the known deposits of iron ore

in this country. In the entire history of the business it never has controlled one-half.

I want to say further that the only known deposits of iron ore that can be imported into this country are controlled by the Pennsylvania Steel Co. and the companies controlled by Charles M. Schwab at Bethlehem. Four years ago the tariff on iron ore was reduced, as has been stated, from 40 cents a ton to 15 cents a ton. I then stated that that meant simply taking 25 cents a ton out of the Treasury of the United States and making a present of it to Charles M. Schwab and the Pennsylvania Steel Co., and that certainly was the effect. In six months after the bill was passed iron ore advanced 50 cents a ton in price. You can readily see that the effect of it was to take 25 cents from the United States Treasury and make a present to Charles M. Schwab and the Pennsylvania Steel Co., for they were the only people that imported iron ore into the country.

Now, following the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee, I say to you, and I think I know something about this business, that if you take the duty off iron ore, now 12 cents a ton from Cuba, it will not affect the price of pig iron to the consumer, it will not affect the price of anything in the country, but the only effect will be to take 12 cents a ton otherwise paid into the United States Treasury and make a present of it to Charles M. Schwab and the Pennsylvania Steel Co.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I was told only yesterday that the Bethlehem Steel Co. was now building and had nearly completed a fleet of vessels to run between here and South America for the purpose of carrying iron ore as soon as the Panama Canal was opened.

Mr. HAYES. That is true.

Mr. AUSTIN. And they have bought large holdings in Chile.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether or not it has been mentioned in this discussion, but I want to say further that the Steel Corporation has been favored in another matter in this bill, and that is the taking off the tariff on manganiferous ore. That is the only corporation in this country that imports manganiferous ore, so they have not only an advantage in the increase in the rate on ferromanganese, but they have the advantage of receiving their manganiferous ore into this country free of duty, and they are the only ones that can use it under the present conditions.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, there are some facts connected with the production of iron ore in our State of which I do not think the Committee on Ways and Means has been fully informed. The United States Steel Corporation by no means controls the major portion of the iron ore produced in our State. Since the Hill leases have been dissolved, and Mr. Hill and his companies will take charge of their holdings next year, they may from their large holdings produce as much as the total production of the Steel Corporation itself. In addition, there are quite a number of mines owned by independents, which produce almost as large a proportion as either of those two holdings already mentioned. Further, there have been discoveries of a new and vast range known as the Cayuna Range, west of the Mesabi Range, which promises to be as large a producer as any of those holdings that have yielded so much in the past. In the new range and in the Mesabi Range the State of Minnesota itself, in its public capacity, owns and controls a very large part of the production by its school and public land leases, and by its public policy, as declared by its legislature and its governor, the State is doing its best to protect the independent producers and the independent steel companies, to prevent monopoly and any possibility for oppressing any of our people, so that the United States Steel Co. by no means has the control of these products of our State. The independents in the future will have even a better opportunity to obtain whatever supplies may be necessary there by means of these policies and these new discoveries. One fact still further should be known by the Committee on Ways and Means. Quite a number of times during the past few years, at various large meetings of the commercial associations and of waterway associations, it has been stated that when the Erie Canal shall be finished this iron ore can be landed from Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan ranges into Buffalo, there transferred to 1,200-ton canal barges, and taken thence through the canal and connecting waterways to the furnaces along the Atlantic coast almost as cheaply as can be done from importation. The advantage that the small tariff on this ore would mean right now would be in the development of these new and independent ranges in Minnesota, together with the proposed development of the new waterway and cheap transportation system from these ranges to the Atlantic coast. The problem of the new range in Minnesota is twofold—first, to separate the ore from the foreign matter, which must be done by means of large water supplies,

which are at hand in northern Minnesota, and, second, to dry the ore after the foreign matter has been washed out of it. Those processes are being developed and will be developed; but it takes a great deal of experimentation and a very great deal of money to do this work, and if you discourage that now, while the new processes of mining and preparing and new methods of transportation are being developed, you will discourage the development of the iron mining, preparation, transportation, and you will help the large holdings of the steel company and discourage the independent producers and the independent competitors of the Steel Corporation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FESS rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I desire to offer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I overlooked the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be closed in 10 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. I do not want more than 2 or 3 minutes upon this amendment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment I desire to offer.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Is it about this ore paragraph?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is to the pig-iron paragraph under consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to cut out any gentlemen who want to speak to the bill. I understand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] desires to address the committee. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Reserving the right to object, there are two or three amendments, and it will be a question how we may divide the time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. In 15 minutes with three gentlemen desiring time, each one would have 5 minutes. I have withdrawn my motion, so that each one of the gentlemen could have 5 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think there has been too much crimination and recrimination against men who rise to speak on this measure as being prejudiced in the interest of the productions in their own districts. I feel a little somewhat like John C. Calhoun, who once said that simply because I believe in a principle that favors my own section that does not mean I am opposed to that principle when applied to another section; and I think that the leader of the majority here upon this particular phase has exemplified this fact with reference to the duty on ore. I would not charge the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] with favoring this particular increase of 35 per cent duty on manganese because he comes from the section possessing United States steel industries. I do not think that statement is quite fair; and I am objecting to the charge of selfishness or sectional interest if I rise to speak in the interest of any particular commodity which happens to be produced in my district that I shall be open to the imputation that my views are colored by my interest in that commodity. That is unfair. This is a larger principle than that. I want to raise this one question here, however, in reference to the point under discussion. President Wilson said that one of the problems before the public was to give equal opportunity to everybody in the rivalry of life. The Democratic Party professes to believe in equalizing opportunities, as I understand it from their platform and their various utterances upon this floor and in the press, and it seems that the Democratic Party has been in opposition to the large concentration of power, if we can rely upon their statements. That seems to be one of the problems for our solution to-day.

This is the question I want to raise: Does not this particular phase of this bill which increases the duty on manganese 350 per cent favor the United States Steel Corporation as against the independent producer? Is not that in direct conflict with the oft-repeated statement of the Democratic leadership and Democratic Party and its following? I think it is. What is the United States Steel Corporation? It is the largest corporation, perhaps, in the world to-day, with a capitalization of

\$1,437,000,000, with units numbering up to 200, and with an ownership in the ores of the country, according to the Commissioner of Corporations, that amounts to from 500,000,000 to 700,000,000 tons in their own title; possessing more than a thousand miles of railroads in their own ownership. This corporation owns more than 100 lake vessels carrying ore upon the Lakes. It owns 50,000 acres of the best grade of coal that is found to-day in this country. This tremendous corporation has an annual capacity of 9,000,000 tons of steel. It can thus save the expense of many of these various items that the independent producer must pay for. The independent producer pays for the coal because he must seek it in the mine, while the United States Steel Corporation owns its mines which supply its needs. The independent producer pays for the ore which he does not possess, although many producers do own ore mines, while the United States Steel Corporation draws its supply from its own mines, with a capacity of hundreds of millions of tons. The United States Steel Corporation does not feel the high railroad rates, because it owns 1,000 miles of railroads. It saves upon the rail transportation, also upon the lake transportation, both of which are important items in the estimates of costs.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. STANLEY. What independents does the gentleman refer to when he says they own no ore and no transportation facilities?

Mr. FESS. I would answer the gentleman that I do not mean that no independent corporation owns any ore. There are many independent corporations that do not own their own ore. I have an independent steel manufacturer in my district who does not own any ore, and there are hundreds of others. The United States Steel Corporation produces 47 per cent, according to the Commissioner of Corporations, of the steel products, which leaves 53 per cent that is produced by the independent mills. It must appear at once how difficult it will be for the small producer to compete with this enormous corporation, with its numerous advantages.

Mr. Chairman, we are informed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] that there is no ferromanganese produced in this country except that which the United States Steel Corporation produces for its own use. That being the case, since the corporation chooses to produce it rather than import it at a rate of \$2.50, the rate fixed by the Payne tariff bill, how can the small producer afford to pay \$8 duty, as proposed by your bill? Since the independent mill can not purchase it from the United States Steel Corporation, as we are informed the latter does not produce it for sale, it will be compelled to pay \$8 duty if this bill becomes law, while its mighty rival can supply its own mills. Is this not a discrimination in favor of the trust? What about the equal opportunity in the world of production about which we hear so much these days?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time is up.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I desire to offer an amendment to paragraph 104, which I understand we have not passed.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Kentucky that there is an understanding under which debate is to close at the end of 15 minutes and that time is to be divided between three gentlemen indicated who desire to be heard. That is included in the motion of the gentleman from Alabama, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is one of those gentlemen.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOORE. I want to offer an amendment at the end of paragraph 104, which I understand is still under consideration.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No, Mr. Chairman; I make the point of order that the paragraph is passed. The paragraph that we are considering is the paragraph that the gentleman from Minnesota offered as an independent section.

Mr. MOORE. My understanding was clear. I was watching the situation. My understanding was that the gentleman's motion was an amendment to that paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] offers an amendment as a new paragraph, No. 104½, and that is the pending paragraph, and paragraph 104 has been passed.

Mr. MANN. Is not the time limited on the debate, anyhow?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Then the gentleman ought not to object to the offering of an amendment.

Mr. MOORE. I have no desire to speak to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. Will the gentleman ask unanimous consent to return?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If there was a misunderstanding on the gentleman's part as to the previous paragraph, he can send up his amendment and let it be voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman can proceed.

Mr. MOORE. There is a pending amendment, and I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman can send it to the desk and the Chair will put it. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 12, after the word "remanufactured," strike out the word "ferromanganese"; and at the end of line 16, same page, strike out the period and insert a semicolon; and insert also the following: "Ferromanganese, \$2.50 per ton."

Mr. MOORE. Now, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. AUSTIN. May I offer my amendment?

Mr. MOORE. The line was so tightly drawn in the discussion over ferromanganese between those of us on this side of the House who believe this ad valorem rate to be excessive and in the interests of the great United States Steel Corporation and the other side of the House, which seems to believe that it was acting in the interests of the consumers of the land, that I call for a vote on the amendment, which squarely states the issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 38, yeas 60.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 9, page 27, strike out "8 per cent ad valorem" and insert "\$2.50 per ton."

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer proposes to retain the present duty on pig iron—\$2.50 per ton. As I understand the new duty on pig iron, it will place a duty of 80 cents to \$1.25 per ton on it, the amount depending upon the market value. The estimate of the Committee on Ways and Means on importations of pig iron the first year under this bill is \$1,500,000, and the importations under the present law last year were \$384,000, making a total increase in the importations of pig iron made abroad of \$1,115,000 per annum under the new bill. I believe the weight of testimony before the Ways and Means Committee at the hearings developed the fact that the amount or cost of labor in the production of a ton of pig iron was 80 per cent. Eighty per cent of the amount would show the wages involved in the increased importations would be \$892,000 per annum, or during four years under the operation of the Underwood bill the amount of wages would be \$3,578,000.43. In other words, we are going to take from the wage earners of this country who are engaged in the manufacture of pig iron \$3,578,000, and give that money to the wage earners in the iron furnaces of England, Germany, Scotland, and China. They are making pig iron in China from \$7 to \$8 per ton. The transportation charges across the Pacific Ocean are \$2.50 per ton.

We heard a speech on the floor of the House from the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] in reference to the pending Japanese question in the State of California. We voted during the last session of Congress for the restriction of undesirable foreign immigration, and came within 6 or 8 votes of a two-thirds vote of passing the measure over the unwelcome veto of President Taft. The argument was that we should protect the American wage earner from the importation of cheap foreign labor into this country. We proposed by the adoption of this new rate on pig iron not to protect the American wage earner in iron furnaces, but to transfer employment from our iron ore mines and our big independent iron furnaces in Alabama, Tennessee, and in the North, and give that work to their competitors in foreign lands. Now, I stated, in the discussion of this metal schedule a year ago, that since the importation of pig iron from China under the reduction of the tariff duty on pig iron the Birmingham furnaces had virtually been driven out of the Pacific coast market. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said:

I will say to my friend, Mr. AUSTIN, that they never did—namely, that the Birmingham mills never did sell any pig iron on the Pacific coast.

Now, I know that the gentleman from Alabama did not intend to make a misstatement. He evidently forgot the facts, because I hold in my hand a letter from the vice president of the Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Co., of Birmingham, Ala., in which

he states that even under the present law they sold 11,880 tons on the Pacific coast, and that under the operations of the Dingley bill they sold 25,000 tons there.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will allow me, it costs them \$10.50 a ton. If that is so, I never heard of it; it is an exceptional case. It costs \$10.50 to carry a ton from Birmingham to the Pacific coast. It costs the English manufacturer \$5.

Now, if they can pay a differential freight rate of \$5.50 from Birmingham to the Pacific coast, in the Lord's name, what do they want with a tariff rate to protect them on the Atlantic seaboard?

Mr. AUSTIN. Here is a letter from the vice president of the Sloss-Sheffield Steel & Iron Co., showing that they did sell on the Pacific coast. On the completion of the Panama Canal I say Birmingham and Tennessee will be able to ship pig iron to the Pacific coast at less than \$10 per ton—perhaps \$2.50 per ton—and will be able successfully to meet the Chinese and English pig iron, provided we can retain the present duty on pig iron.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

105. All iron in slabs, blooms, loops, or other forms less finished than iron in bars, and more advanced than pig iron, except castings; muck bars, bar iron, square iron, rolled or hammered, round iron, in coils or rods, bars or shapes of rolled or hammered iron not specially provided for in this section, 8 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, this provision, with reference to the effort to increase the tax on slabs, structural forms, and pig iron, is utterly indefensible.

In the first place, there is no menace from Chinese or Japanese pig iron. The furnaces that are now erected in China are, the largest of them, under the supervision of an American engineer, the greatest engineer on the globe to-day, Julian Kennedy, who appeared here as a Republican and was for a long time in charge of the works of the Carnegie Steel Co. He stated that from his actual knowledge it costs as much to produce a ton of pig iron in China as it costs in the United States, and he had made pig iron in both countries.

It is universally conceded that a ton of pig iron can be made at Birmingham, Ala., \$4 cheaper than anywhere else in the United States, and Judge Gary and Charlie Schwab and the whole outfit of them admit that we can produce pig iron in the United States cheaper than anywhere else on the habitable globe.

There is an equal amount of nonsense in this hue and cry about producing pig iron with American labor. There is no more American labor used in the production of pig iron in Pittsburgh than is used in Hongkong. I know, too, that the pig iron made in India and the pig iron made in China is made under the supervision of American overseers and American skilled workmen, and the pig iron made in the United States is made under the supervision of Americans, making identically the same labor as when made abroad. Over 50 per cent of the men employed in the blast furnaces in Pittsburgh can not speak the English language. Eighty per cent are foreign born. Not one-tenth of the unskilled labor used in the manufacture of pig iron to-day in Pittsburgh and at Gary but what are either foreign born or of alien parentage. Sixty per cent and over of the miners at the Mesabi Range, digging this ore, are foreign born, and nine-tenths of them do not stay in this country more than 10 years, according to the reports of your Commissioner of Labor.

It is a question of foreign labor both here and there, either way. The work about the pig-iron furnaces is simple but onerous. Those men are worked from 12 to 20 hours a day and seven days in the week. That labor is the poorest-paid skilled labor to-day in the United States, and the Dago and the Montenegrin and the Bohunk and the Syrian have long since not only driven out the American laborer but driven out the German and the Scandinavian and the Welshman and the Englishman.

The only profit that is made by the so-called independents or by the United States Steel Corporation from the manufacture of pig iron is made by the men who own the furnaces and the men who manipulate the bonds.

You talk about the independents having to buy their ore. Where are any independents making pig iron? The United

States Steel Corporation makes 2,000,000 less tons of pig iron than tons of steel, although it takes 11 tons of pig iron to make 10 tons of steel.

The Lackawanna Steel Co., the Bethlehem Steel Co., the Cambria Steel Co.—all these great steel companies in the East—own their own ships and boats, and they own their own deposits of ore. In Birmingham, Ala., they not only work foreign labor, but they work slave labor. They work convicts in the mines—that is, of the Steel Corporation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman is mistaken. There is no convict labor worked at any furnaces or ore mines.

Mr. STANLEY. They work them in the coal mines.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There is some convict labor worked in some of the coal mines, but I think practically now all those coal mines are independent mines.

Mr. STANLEY. I will say for the independent companies in Birmingham that they do not do that, but I have it from the sworn testimony of men who know that until very recently the Steel Corporation sent runners out to the police courts to get boys that were arrested for playing cards on public conveyances or taking a drink of whisky or some other misdemeanor, to get the fellows who were confined in the jails and from the police courts to put them in these mines.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. STANLEY. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. I think the gentleman's memory with reference to the testimony before the committee is mixed with what somebody said they would testify to, because I cross-examined the witnesses before the committee with reference to the particular matter referred to in Birmingham, and the witnesses did not bear out the statements that had been made to the chairman before they came before that committee.

Mr. STANLEY. I will put statements in the Record made by Mr. Harrison, of the Sage Foundation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. STANLEY. I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will yield to the gentleman a minute from my time.

Mr. STANLEY. I do not wish to do anybody an injustice. What I wish to state is that this idea that there is American labor in the coal mines or in the iron mines or about the blast furnaces of the Steel Corporation, whether in Birmingham, in Pittsburgh, or anywhere else, is all moonshine. There is no American labor there except the skilled labor.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not desire to contradict the gentleman, but I must do justice to my own constituency. I do not know where the gentleman got his information, but it is absolutely unwarranted by facts. There never has been any convict labor in any blast furnaces in Alabama.

Mr. STANLEY. If I used the words "blast furnaces," it was an error. I referred to the coal mines.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There never was any convict labor employed in the iron mines. There was a time when the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., now a subsidiary company of the United States Steel Corporation, did work convicts in its coal mines. I am not sure, but I am under the impression that it does not do so now. There are some independent coal operators who do work convicts in their mines.

Mr. BARTLETT. Permit me to say that the testimony from the Steel Corporation before the committee was that they had abandoned that, or at least that that contract had expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It had. Now, as to the gentleman's reference to their gathering men from the police courts, I want to say that he is mistaken in that, because that class of convicts are not worked in the mines. The class of convicts who are worked in the mines are State convicts.

Mr. STANLEY. The difference is this: The State convicts are worked in the mines by the State. Convicts from the jails, convicted of misdemeanors, are worked by the corporation itself. It has its own jail and its own guardians over them. This statement is made—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. What corporation is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. STANLEY. The Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., now the United States Steel Corporation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. STANLEY. This statement is made by Mr. Harrison, of the Sage Foundation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I can not yield any further time, because I want to use it. I am satisfied the gentleman thinks he is correctly informed, but I know he is not, and I think he is doing my people an injustice.

I voted to put iron on the free list. I have cut the products of this schedule without opposition, and it comes out of my

own district; but I can not stand here and allow a statement to be made—I do not mean to charge that it was made intentionally by the gentleman—which is a slander of the constituency that I represent, because the condition described by the gentleman does not exist.

And more than that, although there may be a very low class of European labor that work in some districts of the North, I will say that, so far as my district is concerned, a great deal of the labor is American labor coming out of the hills and mountains of Alabama, and the white labor in that district is largely from northern Europe. The Italians we have in our country do not work in the mines and factories. We have Italians, but they are not engaged either in the furnaces or mines to any great extent. The miners we do have there of foreign birth are made up of old Scotch and Welsh miners that came to Alabama after the great strike in Pennsylvania 30 years ago. So that, although I speak for no other part of the country, I do speak for my district. I do not know from whom the gentleman from Kentucky got his information, but I do say that, as to the district I represent, the facts that he has detailed are not true.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], as he always does, gave us an interesting word picture, but, as usual, conspicuous as a monumental example of inaccuracy of statement.

Mr. Chairman, words idly uttered, even upon the floor of this House, may be taken outside with a degree of seriousness by those who are not acquainted with the habitual methods of the speaker. I can not for one pass in silence and let the statement the gentleman has made go by unanswered. When he says that nine-tenths of the 25,000 miners in my county, whom I represent, do not stay in the United States for a period of five years, he states absolutely that which is not true, however much he may think it is true.

Mr. Chairman, the miners in Minnesota, most of them, are old in experience; most of them have been there a great many years, or elsewhere in the United States, and the big majority of them either are citizens or are in the process of becoming citizens of the United States. [Applause.] They are drawing from \$2.35 to \$3.50 per day. They are building themselves homes; they are buying themselves farms; and they are sending their children to the best-provided schools on God's earth. These boys and girls are growing up to love the American flag. They are growing up to become citizens of the highest character and standing, and any father and mother who will give to their children these advantages, and keep them in these advantages, are not entitled to the description the gentleman from Kentucky has given them. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Kentucky says we have them work from 12 to 20 hours a day. Mr. Chairman, I marvel whence came to him that phantasmagoric dream of a disordered fancy. They work 8 hours a day, and there are three shifts a day.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I stated that in the blast furnaces the employees work 12 hours a day. I quoted the record. The gentleman is not contradicting me, he is contradicting the Commissioner of Labor in a written report.

Mr. MILLER. I am not contradicting anything the gentleman said about blast furnaces, because I do not know anything about them. I am contradicting what he said about the laborers in the mines which he classed with all those, and it is that ridiculous looseness of statement that I think ought not to go unchallenged.

Now, one word in regard to the iron-ore situation, which seems to trouble many gentlemen. I have heard it stated on the floor of the House time and time again, and more often by the gentleman from Kentucky than by anyone else, that the United States Steel Corporation controls the iron-ore deposits in the United States. They never did; they do to-day less than they ever did before. I suppose they control more iron ore in the State of Minnesota than any other part of the country, because there is more iron ore there. Their headquarters are there, their greatest mines are there, because there is found the world's greatest iron-producing region.

Mr. Chairman, the Minnesota State tax board has made extended investigation. Their last report shows that the United States Steel Corporation now in operation of known deposits does not now control over 50 per cent of the ore in my State. Prior to the relinquishment of the so-called Hill lease a year or so ago the Steel Corporation controlled about 63 per cent of the ore in my State. When we also consider the great area recently discovered, known as the Cuyuna Range, one that promises to become one of the greatest iron ranges in the whole world, and in which the Steel Corporation does not control a ton of ore—when we consider this range, which the tax commission did not, the percentage of iron controlled by the Steel Corporation becomes very much less than 50

per cent. In the entire Lake Superior district, comprising Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan, the Steel Corporation controls only about 51.6 per cent. When we examine the situation Nation-wide, we find that the Steel Corporation controls less than 50 per cent of the developed or proven deposits; and as future years witness the proving and development of other deposits within the United States, the per cent controlled by that great corporation will be more and more reduced.

It is ridiculous to say that any one concern does control the iron-ore deposits or has them corralled.

I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], whom we all love and admire very much, when he said that he felt he had played a conspicuous part in divorcing the great northern ore deposits from the United States Steel Corporation. I dislike very much indeed to take from him any of the sentimental feeling he may have in that respect, but I desire to say that a power greater than the gentleman from New York brought about that dissolution. The omnipotent hand that fashioned the universe made that lease absolutely impossible of fulfillment. The discovery of large ore deposits previously unknown created a condition in the ore market such that even the Steel Corporation could not carry out the terms of its Hill lease.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and all amendments thereto close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

106. Beams, girders, joists, angles, channels, car-truck channels, toes, columns and posts or parts or sections of columns and posts, deck and bulb beams, sashes, frames, and building forms, together with all other structural shapes of iron or steel, whether plain, punched, or fitted for use, or whether assembled or manufactured, 12 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, it is all very well for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], without facts or figures or any semblance of information except his bald and impudent assertion, to question the veracity and the accuracy of a gentleman upon this floor in a most offensive manner. He is making a pitiable exhibition, not of my looseness of statement but of his own lamentable ignorance. I have the facts here, which he will not question. I have the report of the tax commissioner of Minnesota, and he says the Steel Corporation owns the greater part of all Minnesota ore. I have a statement of the men who own the ore as to what portion they have of it. The minutes of the Steel Corporation show, Judge Gary himself states—

We certainly have everything on the Vermilion. We bought everything on Mesabi that is good, that is best, that is first class, with perhaps one exception, which we could not get.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Gayley reports that they own 90 per cent of all the best of the old-range ore. In 1901, Gayley declared it was the purpose of the Steel Corporation to get every pound of the remaining 10 per cent of Bessemer ore on the old ranges and all that was left on the Mesabi. Herbert Knox Smith, your own commissioner of corporations, states:

Authoritative data submitted to the Senate Finance Committee in 1909 by a prominent iron manufacturer, with the Steel Corporation's consent, showed that the corporation itself then reckoned on about 1,625,000,000 tons of lake ore, of which 1,258,000,000 tons was of the current commercial standard. On this basis, therefore, the Steel Corporation would have had over 75 per cent of the total commercial available ore in the entire Lake Superior region.

In 1907 the holdings of the Steel Corporation in Minnesota, which State includes the Mesabi and Vermilion ranges, according to a carefully prepared schedule of the Minnesota tax commission, amounted to about 913,000,000 tons, or 76 per cent of the total ore deposits of the State.

Now, that is according to the State tax commissioner, which commissioner is quoted by Herbert Knox Smith.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I can not now. By 1909 the corporation had made further inroads into the slender supply of ores still remaining in this region. Herbert Knox Smith, your Commissioner of Corporations, reports:

In this connection it may be noted that the secretary of the Minnesota tax commission, in a letter to the Commissioner of Corporations, dated May 12, 1909, said: "They (the United States Steel Corporation) now control at least 80 per cent of the present known tonnage in the State."

And in the face of such figures as that the gentleman gets up here with his pitiable declaration about my inaccuracy of statement. The gentleman does not contradict my statement; he contradicts the authoritative record. The gentleman does not advertise my lack of information, but he makes a pitiable exhibition of his own ignorance and of a decent appreciation of his lack of any sort of information on this subject.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to move at the end of 15 minutes that debate on this paragraph close.

Mr. GARDNER. I would like about half a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at the end of 15 minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am not surprised that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] should have further entertained the House by some archaic figures, some back-number observations, and a full measure of rhetorical vituperation. The gentleman quotes from the Steel Corporation, under date of 1901. Iron ore was not discovered on the Mesabi Range until 1892, just 9 years before, and not 20 per cent of the present development had then occurred. What was true then is no more true now than that America is undiscovered, as it was in the youth of Columbus. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Keep still; I will not yield to the gentleman, as he would not yield to me.

Mr. STANLEY. I quoted from 1909.

Mr. MILLER. I will come to 1909 in just a minute. So much for the Steel Corporation's figures in 1901. I will say to the gentleman that since that date the available iron ores in Minnesota have multiplied sixfold and within a few years more they will multiply very many more times as we discover new fields.

Then he comes down a little bit further, and I am astounded that he is able to get within four years of the present. Good God, he has not been within 100 years of the nineteenth century since he began his investigation of the United States Steel Corporation. His committee sat for three months and took testimony that told to the world things we had known in Minnesota for 10 years, and nothing else except a lot of things nobody ever knew before and do not know now.

Mr. Chairman, with a prodigious effort he got within four years of to-day, and he did get a report of the tax commission; but if he had industry equal to his capacity to speak, he would get the figures now, and would find that since 1909 an entirely new range has been opened, greater, perhaps, than either of the others, and in which the Steel Corporation does not own one ton and does not control one ton of iron ore; and if he will come down to this point, he will also find that the Steel Corporation has given up its Hill lease and thereby lost a quarter of its holdings; and having done that, he will find that I told the truth. [Applause on the Republican side.] I invite the gentleman from rhetoric to facts. I invite the gentleman from vituperation to honest and careful consideration of the truth that the House and the country may know the facts. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I entirely agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] in his characterization of the statements of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY]. The only question in my mind is whether the gentleman from Minnesota is not wasting his time in undertaking to educate him, but I will add one more correction for the benefit of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY]. He stated that the independent manufacturers were not able to make pig iron, and that they bought it from the Steel Trust. He was not within 14,000,000 tons of being correct in that statement. The independents manufacture 44 per cent of the pig iron produced in this country.

And now I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that the most recent figures read by the gentleman from Kentucky took no account of the fact that the United States Steel Corporation has canceled its biggest lease, and that the iron-ore lands involved in that lease are no longer in the control of that corporation. Now, I only say it from memory, Mr. Chairman, because I have not had a chance to examine the facts lately, but I am quite sure—and I am speaking only as one of the committee that investigated the United States Steel Corporation—that last summer I came to the conclusion that this Steel Corporation owns or controls between 50 and 55 per cent of the Lake Superior ore lands. I can not tell just at the present instant the figures on which I based that conclusion a year ago, but I shall look them up. At all events, as a result of the cancellation of the Hill ore lease, the whole situation has been changed since the figures were prepared which have just been read by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield? Have you information as to whether or not the Steel Corporation has secured control of the transportation lines, namely, the ore vessels that transport the ore from Mesabi Range to the mills? Is it

not a fact that they are in a position to collect a rebate from those who own and produce that ore?

Mr. GARDNER. Well, the best of my recollection is that the Steel Corporation controls two railroads which transport the iron ore from the Minnesota ranges down to Lake Superior. The railroads are the Duluth, Missabe & Northern and the Duluth & Iron Range.

Mr. MILLER. It is true they control those two, but there are four roads now hauling ore from the range.

Mr. GARDNER. Let me answer from my recollection. I am trying to answer the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN]. I think, at all events, in a large part of that territory, as I remember it, the Steel Corporation had a monopoly of the transportation to the lake. The gentleman from Minnesota in front of me says that the monopoly exists only with regard to ores of the Vermillion Range. The Vermillion is the second most important range.

I rather gathered the impression that it was to the corporation's advantage to have the railroads charge as high rates as possible. Obviously payments made by the Steel Corporation on account of freight pass from one pocket into another inasmuch as the corporation owns the railroads. On the other hand, excessive payments by competitors swell the corporation's profits, at the same time handicapping its competitors. Although I felt that there was great exaggeration in the statements with regard to these excessive payments, nevertheless, I came to the conclusion that the corporation ought not to be permitted to own those railroads. I am inclined to doubt whether it is a sufficient remedy to empower the Interstate Commerce Commission to control rates on those ore roads. Now, with regard to the lake transportation—as I remember it, there is free competition on the Lakes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. If the gentleman will permit, I just read an article in the newspapers where there had been a combination of all the lake-shipping interests, and the Steel Trust was really in control of the whole matter.

Mr. GARDNER. I am simply speaking of the conditions as they were when the investigating committee sat. My impression at the time was that there was free competition on the Lakes, but that the Steel Corporation had an advantage; perhaps they were entitled to it and perhaps they were not. It was largely due to the remarkable foresight displayed by its managers or their predecessors in securing advantageous terminal facilities. In the matter of lake terminals, to the best of my recollection, the United States Steel Corporation has a conspicuous advantage.

For instance, from Conneaut, on Lake Erie, to Pittsburgh, the corporation owns a railroad called the Bessemer & Lake Erie, or the Pittsburgh, Bessemer & Lake Erie—I always forget which railroad is the holding company. Obviously the higher the freight rate charged the better it is for the Steel Corporation. On its own freight its payments pass out of one pocket into the other pocket.

In the case of its competitors the situation is quite otherwise, I did not take the point of view of some gentlemen that this opportunity was flagrantly and outrageously abused. Nevertheless, I doubt whether the Steel Corporation ought to be allowed to own the Pittsburgh, Bessemer & Lake Erie Railroad.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

108. Iron or steel anchors or parts thereof; forgings of iron or steel, or of combined iron and steel, but not machined, tooled, or otherwise advanced in condition by any process or operation subsequent to the forging process, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem; antifriction balls, ball bearings, and roller bearings, of iron or steel or other metal, finished or unfinished, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 28, line 18, insert, after the word "unfinished," the words "and parts thereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking a question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

Under the bill of the last Congress friction balls and ball bearings and roller bearings were subject to a duty of 25 per cent. That duty seems to have been increased to 35 per cent in this bill. I would like to know the reason for this change of heart.

Mr. PALMER. The reason for it is that we found on further investigation that of the amount of production of ball bearings and antifriction ball bearings in this country the imports under

the present rate were a larger proportion of the domestic production than had been supposed. The old rate is 45 per cent, which is now highly protective, because about 75 per cent of the antifriction balls are imported into this country—75 per cent of the American production. I speak roughly; I can not give you the exact figures. So that we raised the rate from 25 per cent to 35 per cent, believing that it was already highly competitive.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the gentleman think it remarkable that he did not have this all-important information when he wrote the other bill?

Mr. PALMER. Well, I think the situation is somewhat changed since the other bill was prepared, and I will say that we had more information at the time this bill was written than we had two years ago or a year and a half ago, of course, because we have been working upon these matters ever since.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] that he has raised the rate on these ball bearings from 25 per cent, as proposed a year ago, to 35 per cent. The present rate is 45 per cent.

The raising of the rate from 25 per cent, as contained in the bill a year ago, to 35 per cent is intended as a protection measure, pure and simple. If the rate were fixed at 25 per cent, all of these ball bearings could be imported. With a 35 per cent rate it is expected that there will be practically no increase of importations and no change in price in this country. The addition from 25 to 35 per cent is intended to protect the industries of the country. I hope it will be a successful protection, and to the extent that it is protective I congratulate my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania and welcome him, to that extent, to the protection ranks. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. Well, if the gentleman from Illinois will excuse me—

Mr. MANN. Certainly—

Mr. PALMER. He will understand that in an article where the rate is now competitive, so that perhaps three-quarters of the amount of the American product comes through the customhouse, the result of an increase from 25 per cent to 35 per cent will simply be an increase in the revenue which the Government will receive.

Mr. MANN. But there is no pretense that there will be any increase in the revenue by this measure, from this paragraph.

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Unless the gentleman again repudiates the figure submitted by his committee.

Mr. PALMER. Thirty-five per cent is more than 25 per cent. The gentleman knows that, or ought to know it.

Mr. MANN. The duty collected on these articles under the present law in 1912 was \$679,000. The gentleman estimates that under this bill there will be collected \$560,000. It is certainly not as a revenue measure that the gentleman proposes to decrease the amount of collections. This duty is raised as a protection measure. Whether it will be successful or not I do not undertake to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

111. All iron or steel sheets, plates, or strips, and all hoop, band, or scroll iron or steel, when galvanized or coated with zinc, spelter, or other metals, or any alloy of those metals; sheets or plates composed of iron, steel, copper, nickel, or other metal with layers of other metal or metals imposed thereon by forging, hammering, rolling, or welding; sheets of iron or steel, polished, planished, or glanced, by whatever name designated, including such as have been pickled or cleaned by acid, or by any other material or process, or which are cold rolled, smoothed only, not polished, and such as are cold hammered, blued, brightened, tempered, or polished by any process to such perfected surface finish or polish better than the grade of cold rolled, smoothed only; and sheets or plates of iron or steel, or taggers iron or steel, coated with tin or lead, or with a mixture of which these metals, or either of them is a component part, by the dipping or any other process, and commercially known as tin plates, terne plates, and taggers tin, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 16, after the word "valorem," strike out the period and insert the following:

"Tin plates, coated with metal, and metal sheets decorated in colors or coated with nickel or other metals, by dipping, printing, stenciling, or other process, 20 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment can be stated very briefly. This is the tin-plate paragraph. There is no provision in the law for tin plate covered with other metal, and under the law as written any such plates would come in under the basket clause in this bill at 25 per cent. We think they should bear the same rate when covered with metal as steel sheets bear when covered with tin, and consequently we insert them here, where they logically belong.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, no man has had much opportunity to know very much about this schedule. There has not been sufficient time for any man to examine it carefully; but this paragraph seems to me entirely and wholly inexcusable. It puts a number of products, made by different processes, in different stages of manufacture, all at the same ad valorem rate. In many instances that ad valorem rate is in excess of the total labor cost, and I am inclined to think in excess of the total converting cost involved in bringing the article to the state of manufacture covered by this paragraph.

Under the Payne law the articles in this paragraph were covered by specific duties covering the conversion cost, in some instances much higher than the conversion cost, it is true, but conforming in most particulars to the conversion cost involved in making the article. The 20 per cent duty provided in this bill is, in many instances, as I have said, several times the labor cost involved in bringing the article to the stage of manufacture covered by the paragraph. In many instances 5 per cent would be amply sufficient to cover the difference in cost of production at home and abroad. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] will more nearly conform to the pledge of his party for downward revision if he follows the classification pursued in the Payne law and reduces some of the rates provided in this paragraph instead of increasing the rates by the application of a flat rate of 20 per cent ad valorem.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] a question that perhaps I should have propounded under the one hundred and ninth paragraph of the bill. I understand the design is to make cotton ties free, whilst other hoops of iron or steel are subject to an ad valorem duty of 12 per cent. Now, I am told that the same phraseology has been used in this paragraph, putting cotton ties on the free list, as formerly was used in other tariff bills where cotton ties were put in with other hoops and strips of steel subjected to a duty. I desire to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he is satisfied that there is a sufficient distinction made in describing the cotton ties in the five hundred and fourteenth section of the free list, or if he does not think that there are a great many strips of steel that are not designed for cotton ties that might be imported under the one hundred and ninth section?

Mr. PALMER. I will say to my colleague that the language of section 514 was drafted after a conference with experts in the Treasury Department, and we believe it is clear enough to cover simply cotton ties and baling ties.

Mr. HULINGS. How is it with the one hundred and ninth section—hoops and bands of steel and iron?

Mr. PALMER. Section 109 provides for band iron or steel "not otherwise provided for in this section," which means, as far as that paragraph is concerned, "not provided for in paragraph 514," which is also a part of the same section as paragraph 109. So under the bill as it now stands cotton ties would come in under 514 free, and all band, hoop, or scroll iron under 109 at 12 per cent.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is satisfied that that makes the distinction, very well.

Mr. PALMER. I am satisfied that it makes it as clearly as language can make it. We intended to put cotton ties on the free list in paragraph 514, and it is so written. In the opinion of the cotton producer and the persons who buy cotton ties, in the opinion of the manufacturers of hoop and band iron, it will put cotton ties on the free list. The only question is whether in doing it something else which looks like cotton ties may go on the free list. But I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that section 514 requires something to have been done to the hoop or band steel to indicate the purpose for which it is going to be used, and that process will be a sufficient indication to allow only such ties to come in.

I recognize that there is some difficulty about it. There may be trouble about it, but in accordance with our purpose to put baling ties on the free list, it being impossible to make it more definite, we believe that we have got as near to our purpose as we can.

Mr. HULINGS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I have a communication from the Sharon Hoop Steel Co., a large independent concern in my district making these articles, and they suggest that under the phraseology used in section 514, which is the same as heretofore used in describing ties as hoops or bands when they were all subject to duty, that they believe that the division of cotton ties in that paragraph 514 should be as stated in this letter, which was directed to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

SHARON STEEL HOOP CO.,
Sharon, Pa., April 21, 1913.

DEAR SIR: I would respectfully direct your attention to paragraph No. 518 in the free list of the Underwood bill now under consideration in the House. This paragraph reads:

"Hoop or band iron or hoop or band steel, cut to lengths, or wholly or partly manufactured into hoops or ties, coated or not coated with paint or any other preparation, with or without buckles or fastenings, for baling cotton or any other commodity."

As I understood, when appearing before your committee, this was designed to admit cotton ties only to this country free of duty. As the paragraph is worded it will be impossible for even an expert in the steel business to prevent the free importation of hoops and other similar commodities unless the phraseology is changed.

Paragraph No. 111 of Schedule C of the bill provides for a duty on hoops and bands or scroll iron or steel of 12 per cent ad valorem, and the two paragraphs are necessarily conflicting.

If I am correct in my understanding that it is the purpose of the committee to admit cotton ties free, but to give to hoops and bands the same rate of duty as to other like steel commodities for revenue purposes, then there is no doubt but that the phraseology of paragraph No. 518 should be changed. As a cotton tie is a strip of steel 15/16 of an inch wide by 20 gauge, coated with cotton varnish, put up in bundles of 45 each, each bundle having 30 buckles, I would earnestly urge that a wording more correctly describing cotton ties be given, and in order to make the description broad enough to leave no question about cotton ties, regardless of some slight variation from the standard width, gauge, and length, being admitted free, would ask, if possible, that this paragraph be changed to read as follows:

"Strips of iron or steel narrower than 1 1/2 inches and lighter than 15 wire gauge, cut to length, painted or unpainted, with or without buckles, for baling cotton or any other commodity, and to be used as baling ties only."

Your attention to this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly, yours,

SHARON STEEL HOOP CO.,
President.

Those are the suggestions of a gentleman who is in that business who fears that in the importation there will be a great many strips that look like cotton ties and fall within the phraseology, but which may be imported under paragraph 514 when they ought to fall under another paragraph carrying a tariff duty of 12 per cent.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I seldom quote figures from memory. Gentlemen who have furnished us with many broad assertions have quoted no figures, and have shown no authority whatever. I am so well acquainted with the data in this case that I can quote it accurately from memory. I wish to put in the Record certain statements from the report of Commissioner Neill, whom a Democratic President wished to keep in power on account of his ability and conservatism.

As you understand, about 80 per cent of the ores on the Mesabi Range prior to giving up the Hill leases were controlled by the Steel Corporation. The company which mined the ores was known as the Oliver Iron Mining Co. Of the total in the year 1907 of 12,018 employees, only 879 were native born. Those of foreign birth being 84.4 per cent of the total number of employees. Almost one-half foreign born, 49.3 per cent, had not resided in the United States over two years. I will put in the Record a table showing that out of 10,000 only 452 had resided 6 years; 3,237, 5 years; 900, 4 years; and only 1,205 over 10 years. Only 48.6 per cent of the employees considered in this table can speak English.

The table is as follows:

POPULATION AND NATIONALITY.

The mines have attracted a population remarkable in several ways. The increase of numbers has been rapid. The following table shows the population of the chief range communities in 1895, 1900, and 1905:

Population in the chief mining communities of St. Louis County, Minn., 1895, 1900, and 1905.

[From the Fifth Decennial Census of Minnesota, 1905, p. 42.]

Localities.	1895	1900 ¹	1905	
			Num-ber.	Percent of in-crease over 1895.
Aurora village.....			336	
Biwabik Township.....	365	500	541	48.2
Biwabik village.....	1,011	1,299	946	26.4
Breitung (including Soudan).....	1,954	2,034	1,344	31.2
Buhl village.....			788	
Chisholm village.....			4,231	
Ely city.....	2,260	3,717	4,045	79.0
Eveleth city.....	764	2,732	5,332	597.9
Fayal Township.....	222	1,016	1,316	492.8
Hibbing village.....	1,085	2,481	6,566	505.2
McKinley village.....	136	262	232	70.6
Mesabi Mountain Township.....	708	1,296	940	32.8
Mountain Iron village.....	443	470	604	36.3
Sparta village.....		950	960	
Stuntz Township.....	68	1,083	1,749	2,472.1
Tower city.....	1,265	1,366	1,340	5.9
Virginia city.....	3,647	2,962	6,056	66.1
St. Louis County (excluding Duluth).....	19,199	29,963	52,571	173.8

¹ Figures from the Twelfth Census of the United States.

² Decrease.

Several of these communities show an enormous increase in population from 1895 to 1905, while only two show a decline.

Of the population of St. Louis County, 84 per cent reside in cities or villages, which is very conclusive as to the predominance of the iron-ore industry.

The leading nationalities were Finnish, Austrian, Swedish, Canadian, and Norwegian, in the order named. As shown by the State census of 1905, the nationalities represented and their respective numbers in the chief mining centers were as follows:

Principal foreign-born elements of the population in the chief range communities of Minnesota, 1905.

[Data from the Fifth Decennial Census of Minnesota, 1905, p. 177.]

Localities.	Country of birth.						
	Ger-many.	Swe-den.	Nor-way.	Den-mark.	Can-a-da.	Ire-land.	Rus-sia.
Vermilion Range:							
Breitung (including Soudan).....	7	130	21	2	7	3	20
Ely city.....	22	101	29	5	55	9	104
Tower city.....	10	156	67	1	85	9	23
Mesabi Range:							
Aurora village.....	8	26	7	1	16	4	12
Biwabik Township.....	2	37	20	2	18	2	16
Biwabik village.....	12	57	26	2	38	8	19
Buhl village.....	9	64	23		24	1	6
Chisholm village.....	21	206	93	2	110	19	87
Eveleth city.....	38	325	77	6	151	39	119
Fayal Township.....	14	85	22	1	16	10	20
Hibbing village.....	72	516	314	9	498		78
McKinley village.....	1	15	21		1	2	6
Mesabi Mountain Town-ship.....	7	38	2		20	11	37
Mountain Iron village.....	5	20	17	5	34	13	14
Sparta village.....	5	17	8		42	5	9
Stuntz Township.....	12	65	47	2	148	10	3
Virginia city.....	120	557	296	7	337	53	71
St. Louis County outside Duluth.....	770	4,226	1,898	112	2,433	312	763
							400

Localities.	Country of birth.				Total foreign born.	Total native born.	Total popu-lation.
	Pol-land.	Fin-land.	Aus-tria.	All other.			
Vermilion Range:							
Breitung (including Soudan).....		280	180	9	659	685	1,344
Ely city.....		911	852	122	2,222	1,823	4,045
Tower city.....		184	29	19	593	747	1,340
Mesabi Range:							
Aurora village.....	1	62	44	14	198	138	336
Biwabik Township.....		111	98	14	320	221	541
Biwabik village.....		287	44	17	516	430	946
Buhl village.....		200	64	50	448	340	788
Chisholm village.....	43	1,197	693	187	2,705	1,526	4,231
Eveleth city.....	1	1,145	676	333	2,975	2,357	5,332
Fayal Township.....	5	152	430	164	927	389	1,316
Hibbing village.....	30	1,169	323	481	3,537	3,029	6,566
McKinley village.....		31	34	4	116	116	232
Mesabi Mountain Town-ship.....		250	130	31	531	409	940
Mountain Iron village.....		127	14	37	290	314	604
Sparta village.....		347	116	11	584	376	960
Stuntz Township.....	9	220	279	299	1,104	645	1,749
Virginia city.....	77	1,193	136	123	3,059	2,997	6,056
St. Louis County outside Duluth.....	296	9,945	4,461	2,313	27,929	24,642	52,571

No statistics as to nationality are regularly kept by the mining companies, but the Oliver Iron Mining Co. has taken a census of its own employees at different times, the results of which are given below:

Length of residence in the United States of foreign-born employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co., May 1, 1907, by race or people.

[Data supplied by the Oliver Iron Mining Co.]

Race or people.	Number living in the United States—						
	Under 1 year.	1 year.	2 years.	3 years.	4 years.	5 years.	6 years.
Austrian.....	135	199	155	92	76	55	29
Bohemian.....	3	14	8	3	4	3	3
Bosnian.....	24	58	39	11	9	3	1
Bulgarian.....	79	57	41	23	2	5	
Croatian.....	280	496	419	240	141	103	56
Czech.....	2	5	1	1			
Dalmatian.....	43	34	25	4	10	4	1
English.....		9	6	1	4	9	5
Finnish.....	263	389	464	244	271	263	134
Flemish.....		2					
French.....	3	4	4	1	2	2	3
French-Canadian.....	1	2		1	1	2	2
German.....	49	27	30	16	7	4	4
Greek.....				1	1		
Hebrew.....		1					
Hervat.....	2	3	4	2	3	2	3
Hungarian.....	8	8	12	5	3	3	1
Irish.....		1		1	2	1	2

Length of residence in the United States of foreign-born employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co., etc.—Continued.

Race or people.	Number living in the United States—						
	Under 1 year.	1 year.	2 years.	3 years.	4 years.	5 years.	6 years.
Italian.....	27	39	40	19	37	24	14
Italian (north).....	23	65	50	23	31	30	19
Italian (south).....	43	79	101	50	47	54	35
Japanese.....			2				
Korean.....						1	
Lithuanian.....	1		1				
Macedonian.....	1						
Magyar.....	19	34	46	21	36	24	10
Montenegrin.....	35	40	21	5	1		
Polish.....	12	33	20	22	16	10	6
Roumanian.....	1	1	2	1			
Russian.....	3	11	8	9	7	4	
Ruthenian.....						1	1
Scandinavian.....	29	23	44	30	35	28	26
Scotch.....	1	1	1	1	2		2
Servian.....	16	29	18	15	7	6	2
Slav.....	26	30	26	23	20	12	12
Slovak.....	46	47	68	29	33	40	20
Slovenian.....	25	66	85	42	47	44	27
Syrian.....						1	
Tyrolese.....	5	10	18	13	18	11	9
Not reported.....	56	73	84	29	44	27	25
Total.....	1,261	1,879	1,856	976	917	776	452

Race or people.	Number living in the United States—						Total foreign born.
	7 years.	8 years.	9 years.	10 years.	Over 10 years.	Years not reported.	
Arabian.....	1						1
Austrian.....	19	16	5	4	27	2	81
Bohemian.....					11		49
Bosnian.....						1	146
Bulgarian.....	1	1			1		210
Croatian.....	25	29	13	12	59	8	1,881
Czech.....					1		11
Dalmatian.....	4	3		1			129
Dutch.....					2		2
English.....	2	5		5	114		160
Finnish.....	127	73	35	43	216	3	2,525
Flemish.....					1		3
French.....		2	2	1	44	1	69
French-Canadian.....	1	4	1		8		22
German.....	3	3	2	3	42		190
Greek.....					1		3
Hebrew.....	1				3		5
Hervat.....	1						20
Hungarian.....		3			5		48
Indian.....		1					1
Irish.....	1	1			71	1	81
Italian.....	12	3	1	3	15	1	235
Italian (north).....	9	9	5	5	26	3	298
Italian (south).....	26	12	5	8	35		495
Japanese.....							2
Korean.....							1
Lithuanian.....					1		3
Macedonian.....							1
Magyar.....	1	4	4	2	9		210
Montenegrin.....							102
Polish.....	9	1		5	15	2	151
Roumanian.....							5
Russian.....	1	2			5		50
Ruthenian.....					1		3
Scandinavian.....	14	23	12	11	241	5	521
Scotch.....	2	2			41		53
Scotch-Irish.....					1		1
Servian.....	1				1		95
Slav.....	10	7	4	3	18		191
Slovak.....	18	11	2	6	38	1	359
Slovenian.....	19	12	3	8	34	3	415
Syrian.....							1
Tyrolese.....	1	4	2	1	17		109
Welsh.....					3		3
Not reported.....	14	5	4	4	98	2	465
Total.....	323	236	100	125	1,205	33	10,139

Of the 12,018 employees of this company in 1907 only 1,879 were native born, those of foreign birth being 84.4 per cent of the total number employed. Almost half of the foreign born, 49.3 per cent, had not resided in the United States over two years. The races showing a large proportion who had resided in this country 10 years and over were: The Irish, with 87.7 per cent; Scotch, 77.4 per cent; English, 74.4 per cent; Scandinavian, 48.4 per cent; and German, 23.7 per cent. Those with a small proportion were: Bulgarians, with less than one-half of 1 per cent; Austrians and Croatians, with only 3.8 per cent; Italians, 8.9 per cent; Finns, 10.3 per cent; and Slavs, 11 per cent. Of all the foreign-born employees but 13.1 per cent had resided in the United States 10 years and over. The principal races with a residence of less than a year were the Montenegrins, with 34.3 per cent; Austrians, 16.6 per cent; Croatians, 14.9 per cent; Slavs, 13.6 per cent; and Slovaks, 12.8 per cent. Of all the foreign-born employees 12.4 per cent had resided in the United States less than one year.

In the following tabulation, which was furnished by the Oliver Iron Mining Co., American includes Canadians, English, Irish, and Scotch; Austrian includes, among others, Bulgarians, Bohemians, Hungarians,

and Montenegrins; French and German includes Belgians, Swiss, and Hollanders; Finnish includes Russians; and Scandinavian includes Norwegians, Swedes, and Danes.

Nationality of the employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co. on the various ranges of the Lake Superior region July 1, 1908, by locality.

[Data supplied by the Oliver Iron Mining Co.]

Locality.	American.		Austrian.		French and German.	
	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.
Mesabi Range:						
Hibbing district.....	628	21.9	1,326	46.2	140	4.9
Mountain Iron district.....	217	22.9	446	47.1	16	1.7
Eveleth (Fayal) district.....	296	27.4	316	29.2	40	3.7
Eveleth (Adams) district.....	225	18.9	544	45.8	12	1.0
Biwabik district.....	74	20.9	204	57.5	4	1.1
Canisteo district.....	383	28.2	606	44.6	77	5.7
Total.....	1,823	23.4	3,442	44.1	289	3.7
Vermilion Range.....	85	15.3	291	52.2	13	2.3
Marquette Range.....	680	49.2	20	1.5	10	.7
Menominee Range.....	195	16.5	120	10.2	141	12.0
Gogebic Range.....	442	28.3	109	7.0	38	2.4
Grand total.....	3,225	25.8	3,982	31.9	491	3.9

Locality.	Finnish.		Italian.		Polish.	
	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.
Mesabi Range:						
Hibbing district.....	212	7.4	378	13.2	65	2.2
Mountain Iron district.....	100	10.6	79	8.4		
Eveleth (Fayal) district.....	125	11.6	165	15.3	1	.1
Eveleth (Adams) district.....	188	15.8	123	10.3	20	1.7
Biwabik district.....	53	14.9	3	.8	2	.6
Canisteo district.....	92	6.8	51	3.7	5	.4
Total.....	770	9.9	799	10.2	93	1.2
Vermilion Range.....	100	18.0	21	3.8		
Marquette Range.....	415	30.0	108	7.8	7	.5
Menominee Range.....	81	6.9	201	17.0	79	6.7
Gogebic Range.....	405	26.0	162	10.4	199	12.7
Grand total.....	1,771	14.2	1,291	10.4	378	3.0

Locality.	Scandinavian.		Miscellaneous.		Total.	
	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.
Mesabi Range:						
Hibbing district.....	116	4.0	6	0.2	2,871	100.0
Mountain Iron district.....	88	9.3			946	100.0
Eveleth (Fayal) district.....	135	12.5	2	.2	1,080	100.0
Eveleth (Adams) district.....	69	5.8	8	.7	1,189	100.0
Biwabik district.....	15	4.2			355	100.0
Canisteo district.....	143	10.5	2	.1	1,359	100.0
Total.....	566	7.3	18	.2	7,800	100.0
Vermilion Range.....	47	8.4			557	100.0
Marquette Range.....	142	10.3			1,382	100.0
Menominee Range.....	362	30.7			1,179	100.0
Gogebic Range.....	204	13.1	1	.1	1,560	100.0
Grand total.....	1,321	10.6	19	.2	12,478	100.0

Nationality of the employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co. on the various ranges of the Lake Superior region June 1, 1909, by locality.

[Data supplied by the Oliver Iron Mining Co.]

Locality.	American.		Austrian.		Finnish.	
	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.
Mesabi Range:						
Hibbing district.....	472	29.5	671	41.9	67	4.2
Chisholm district.....	149	9.1	1,002	61.5	154	9.5
Mountain Iron district.....	178	24.7	236	32.8	170	23.6
Eveleth (Fayal) district.....	262	20.7	377	29.8	256	20.2
Eveleth (Adams) district.....	283	21.4	603	45.7	140	10.6
Biwabik district.....	53	16.6	193	60.5	45	14.1
Canisteo district.....	355	22.8	733	47.1	131	8.4
Total.....	1,752	20.8	3,815	45.4	963	11.5
Vermilion Range.....	99	12.9	402	52.6	175	22.9
Marquette Range.....	739	49.5	40	2.7	372	24.9
Menominee Range.....	228	15.8	165	11.5	98	6.8
Gogebic Range.....	435	22.7	137	7.1	625	32.5
Grand total.....	3,253	23.2	4,559	32.5	2,233	15.9

Nationality of the employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co., etc.—Contd.

Locality.	German.		French.		Italian.	
	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.
Mesabi Range:						
Hibbing district.....	52	3.3	47	2.9	209	13.1
Mountain Iron district.....	5	.3	2	.1	155	9.5
Eveleth (Fayal) district.....	12	1.7	36	5.0	224	17.7
Eveleth (Adams) district.....	17	1.3	4	.3	177	13.4
Biwabik district.....	9	.7	3	.2	3	.9
Canisteo district.....	4	1.3	80	5.2	33	2.1
Total.....	118	1.4	145	1.7	837	10.0
Vermilion Range.....	2	.3	4	.5	30	3.9
Marquette Range.....	13	.9	5	.4	178	11.9
Menominee Range.....	33	2.3	122	8.5	284	19.7
Gogebic Range.....	12	.6	37	1.9	232	12.1
Grand total.....	178	1.3	313	2.2	1,561	11.1

Locality.	Scandinavian.		Polish.		Total.	
	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.	Num-ber.	Per-cent.
Mesabi Range:						
Hibbing district.....	59	3.7	23	1.4	1,600	100.0
Chisholm district.....	104	6.4	58	3.6	1,629	100.0
Mountain Iron district.....	88	12.2	23	1.8	720	100.0
Eveleth (Fayal) district.....	108	8.5	20	1.5	1,267	100.0
Eveleth (Adams) district.....	84	6.4	14	.9	1,320	100.0
Biwabik district.....	21	6.6	14	.9	319	100.0
Canisteo district.....	179	11.5	14	.9	1,556	100.0
Total.....	643	7.6	138	1.6	8,411	100.0
Vermilion Range.....	53	6.9	102	7.1	765	100.0
Marquette Range.....	145	9.7	260	13.5	1,492	100.0
Menominee Range.....	407	28.3	102	7.1	1,430	100.0
Gogebic Range.....	184	9.6	260	13.5	1,922	100.0
Grand total.....	1,432	10.2	500	3.6	14,029	100.0

This company had 12,478 employees on July 1, 1908. The Americans were 25.8 per cent of this number. The Austrians were the most numerous, with 31.9 per cent. On the Vermilion range 52.2 per cent of the employees were Austrians.

On June 1, 1909, this company had 14,029 employees, of whom 23.2 per cent were Americans, 32.5 per cent Austrians, 15.0 per cent Finnish, etc. Those nationalities that showed an increased proportion employed in 1909 compared with 1908 were Austrians, Finnish, Italians, and Polish. Those that decreased were Americans, French, German, and Scandinavians.

Number and per cent of foreign-born employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co. who speak English, May 1, 1907, by race or people.

[Data supplied by the Oliver Iron Mining Co. Figures do not include 25 persons not reporting as to whether they do or do not speak English.]

Race or people.	Speak Eng-lish.		Do not speak Eng-lish.	Total.
	Num-ber.	Per-cent.		
Arabian.....	1	100.0	1	1
Austrian.....	244	30.0	570	814
Bohemian.....	25	51.0	24	49
Bosnian.....	29	19.9	117	146
Bulgarian.....	24	11.4	186	210
Croatian.....	580	30.8	1,310	1,891
Czech.....	2	18.2	9	11
Dalmatian.....	44	34.1	85	129
Dutch.....	2	100.0	2	4
English.....	160	100.0	2	162
Finnish.....	1,372	54.4	1,151	2,523
Flemish.....	1	33.3	2	3
French.....	64	92.8	5	69
French-Canadian.....	20	90.9	2	22
German.....	84	44.2	106	190
Greek.....	2	66.7	1	3
Hebrew.....	4	80.0	1	5
Hervat.....	9	45.0	11	20
Hungarian.....	23	47.9	25	48
Indian.....	1	100.0	1	2
Irish.....	81	100.0	81	162
Italian.....	146	62.1	89	235
Italian (north).....	164	55.0	134	298
Italian (south).....	257	51.9	238	495
Japanese.....	2	100.0	2	4
Korean.....	1	100.0	1	2
Lithuanian.....	3	100.0	3	6
Macedonian.....	1	100.0	1	2
Magyar.....	72	34.3	138	210
Montenegrin.....	28	27.5	74	102
Polish.....	70	46.4	81	151
Roumanian.....	2	40.0	3	5
Russian.....	22	44.0	28	50
Ruthenian.....	3	100.0	3	6

Number and per cent of foreign-born employees, etc.—Continued.

Race or people.	Speak Eng-lish.		Do not speak Eng-lish.	Total.
	Num-ber.	Per-cent.		
Scandinavian.....	451	87.6	64	515
Scotch.....	53	100.0	1	54
Scotch-Irish.....	1	100.0	1	2
Servian.....	14	14.7	81	95
Slav.....	71	37.2	120	191
Slovak.....	145	40.4	214	359
Slovenian.....	327	79.0	87	414
Syrian.....	1	100.0	1	2
Tyrolese.....	68	62.4	41	109
Welsh.....	3	100.0	3	6
Not reported.....	240	53.5	209	449
Total.....	4,917	48.6	5,197	10,114

Only 48.6 per cent of the employees considered in this table can speak English. A considerable number of the races reported 100 per cent able to speak English, but the number of persons involved is too small upon which to base a conclusion. Austrians report 30 per cent; Croats, 30.8 per cent; Magyars, 34.3 per cent; Slavs, 37.2 per cent; and Slovaks, 40.4 per cent speaking English, while the Italians report 55.2 per cent; Finnish, 54.4 per cent; Slovenians, 79 per cent; and Scandinavians, 87.6 per cent who speak English.

Number and per cent of foreign-born employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co., 5 years in the United States, who have become naturalized, May 1, 1907, by race or people.

[Data supplied by the Oliver Iron Mining Co. Figures do not include 68 persons not reporting as to naturalization.]

Race of people.	Naturalized.		Not natu-ralized.	Total.
	Num-ber.	Per-cent.		
Arabian.....	52	33.5	103	155
Austrian.....	9	52.9	8	17
Bohemian.....	2	25.0	6	8
Bosnian.....	73	24.6	224	297
Bulgarian.....	1	100.0	1	2
Croatian.....	2	15.4	11	13
Czech.....	2	100.0	2	4
Dalmatian.....	114	83.2	23	137
Dutch.....	310	34.9	578	888
English.....	40	81.6	9	49
Finnish.....	9	50.0	9	18
Flemish.....	41	68.3	19	60
French.....	1	100.0	1	2
French-Canadian.....	3	100.0	3	6
Greek.....	6	50.0	6	12
Hebrew.....	1	100.0	1	2
Hervat.....	1	100.0	1	2
Hungarian.....	65	87.8	9	74
Indian.....	22	30.6	50	72
Irish.....	35	34.3	67	102
Italian.....	53	30.5	121	174
Italian (north).....	1	100.0	1	2
Italian (south).....	7	13.0	47	54
Korean.....	11	25.0	33	44
Lithuanian.....	5	41.7	7	12
Magyar.....	1	33.3	2	3
Polish.....	242	69.5	106	348
Russian.....	33	82.5	7	40
Ruthenian.....	1	100.0	1	2
Scandinavian.....	1	11.1	8	9
Scotch.....	21	31.8	45	66
Scotch-Irish.....	42	21.1	93	135
Servian.....	34	28.6	85	119
Slav.....	27	60.0	18	45
Slovak.....	3	100.0	3	6
Slovenian.....	83	48.5	88	171
Syrian.....	Not reported.....			
Total.....	1,351	42.9	1,798	3,149

There have been naturalized 42.9 per cent of those who have been in the United States five years. About one-third of the Austrians, Finns, Italians, Slavs, and Slovaks have availed themselves of citizenship through the naturalization laws. Over 80 per cent of the English, Irish, and Scotch and 69.5 per cent of the Scandinavians are naturalized.

Number and per cent of foreign-born employees of the Oliver Iron Mining Co., 21 years of age and over, reporting conjugal condition, May 1, 1907, by race or people.

Race or people.	Married.		Single.	Total.
	Num-ber.	Per-cent.		
Arabian.....	343	52.3	313	656
Austrian.....	21	52.5	19	40
Bohemian.....	78	68.4	36	114

Number and per cent of foreign-born employees, etc.—Continued.

Race or people.	Married.		Single.	Total.
	Num-ber.	Per cent.		
Bulgarian.....	118	64.8	64	182
Croatian.....	903	58.4	642	1,545
Czech.....	4	40.0	6	10
Dalmatian.....	73	74.5	25	98
Dutch.....	1	50.0	1	2
English.....	89	58.2	64	153
Finnish.....	502	39.3	1,392	2,294
Flemish.....	1	33.3	2	3
French.....	41	63.1	24	65
French-Canadian.....	21	95.5	1	22
German.....	100	58.8	70	170
Greek.....	2	66.7	1	3
Hebrew.....	1	33.3	2	3
Hervat.....	10	52.6	9	19
Hungarian.....	27	62.8	16	43
Indian.....	36	45.0	44	80
Irish.....	106	50.7	103	209
Italian.....	147	56.5	113	260
Italian, north.....	263	59.2	181	444
Italian, south.....	1	100.0	1	2
Japanese.....	1	33.3	2	3
Korean.....	1	100.0	1	2
Lithuanian.....	1	100.0	1	2
Macedonian.....	100	54.9	82	182
Magyar.....	26	34.7	49	75
Montenegrin.....	65	47.4	72	137
Polish.....	4	80.0	1	5
Roumanian.....	23	53.5	20	43
Russian.....	2	100.0	2	4
Ruthenian.....	225	47.5	249	474
Scandinavian.....	28	54.9	23	51
Scotch.....	1	100.0	1	2
Scotch-Irish.....	31	46.3	36	67
Servian.....	95	57.2	71	166
Slav.....	167	54.6	139	306
Slovak.....	202	56.6	155	357
Slovenian.....	43	41.7	60	103
Syrian.....	1	33.3	2	3
Tyrolese.....	235	58.8	165	400
Welsh.....				
Not reported.....				
Total.....	4,538	51.6	4,258	8,796

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman give the figures showing that?

Mr. STANLEY. I will.

Mr. MILLER. From what is the gentleman reading?

Mr. STANLEY. From Commissioner Neill's report of 1907 and 1908. Here is a report of 1908 giving the total of—

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. I was present a few moments ago when the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] was suppressed for not speaking to the subject matter before this House. I raise the point of order that the gentleman from Kentucky is not speaking to the subject matter before the House.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Connecticut if he will withhold that until the gentleman from Kentucky—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut makes the point of order that the gentleman from Kentucky is not addressing himself to the amendment before the House.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will permit me to correct a statement that has been made.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this ought to be fair. The gentleman from Tennessee was suppressed, and he was put into a position that needed to be explained, and there ought to be some limit to these gentlemen who are old Members of the House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut makes the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman that I will put into the Record a statement showing 10,139 employees—Arabian, Austrian, Bohemian, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Croatian, Czech, Dalmatian, Dutch, English, Finnish, Flemish, French—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut makes the point of order, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. STANLEY. I am talking about iron ore—Japanese, Korean, Macedonian, Magyar, Montenegrin, Polish, Roumanian, and Russian, giving the numbers—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order. I have no objection to the gentleman talking, as far as I am concerned, but iron ore is not the subject under discussion at this time.

Mr. STANLEY. I have concluded, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. In violation of the rules of the House the gentleman has concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I submit there is no amendment pending.

Mr. MADDEN. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, that amendment was pending.

Mr. PALMER. But debate on it has been exhausted.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I move to strike out the last two words. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a good deal of controversy here as to what constitutes an American citizen, whether anybody has a right to work in any employment in this country except a man who is born on American soil. There seems to be an attempt made to discredit men who have been born somewhere else than in America.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. DONOVAN. The gentleman from Illinois is not speaking to the subject before the House. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I was endeavoring to reply to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the Chair sustained the point of order made by the gentleman from Connecticut to the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman from Kentucky talked on, however.

Mr. MADDEN. I desire to discuss the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has sustained the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Then the Chair does not care to hear arguments upon it?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is pretty clear in his own mind on that proposition. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman's point of order is not well taken, for the reason that in a discussion of the question of this tariff bill or of any section or any paragraph of the bill it seems to me we have a right to enter into every phase of the question so that we may be enabled to act intelligently upon it when we are called upon to vote. It seems to me that labor is one of the essential elements in the consideration of the question of the tariff, and that the question of whether a man is an American citizen or whether he has a right to live here if he is not one is one of the questions to be considered. It does not make any difference whether a man was born in England, Ireland, Scotland, or Wales, he ought to have a right to live wherever he may be, and ought to have the right to work wherever he can find employment. There was a time not many years ago, during the history of my short experience, when the men who did the mining, the work that is being done in these mines, preparing the ore for the mills, came from England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales.

The time came when the children of these men attended the public schools of the United States and assimilated with the American people, became identified with American institutions, became lovers of the American flag. They went from these lowly employments in other walks of life. They became doctors, and merchants, and lawyers, and bankers, and manufacturers—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. And Congressmen.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MADDEN. They became active instruments in the development of the institutions of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky demands the regular order.

Mr. MADDEN. I am discussing this point of order, Mr. Chairman. [Laughter.]

Mr. POWERS. The Chair has ruled on the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. No; the Chair allowed the gentleman to discuss the point of order, and that is what I am discussing.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, the disposition of the Chair, naturally, as the gentleman knows, is to give every man a chance.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not often take up the time of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. But where there is a demand for the enforcement of the rule, of course the Chair must enforce the rule, and the gentleman from Illinois knows the rule.

Mr. MADDEN. I do, and, Mr. Chairman, I am trying to discuss the point of order as best I can. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. I hope the committee will indulge me in a discussion of this question. I hope the gentleman who made the point of order will withdraw it, because I think this is an important phase of this question and I hope I may be permitted to proceed.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the gentleman be allowed to continue his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not care to do that; I do not do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is demanded.

Mr. MADDEN. I will get an opportunity to object to some things which gentlemen may want to do one of these days and I will do it. Now, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that he may be allowed to proceed.

Mr. GUDGER. Mr. Chairman, I object. I hope the gentleman will avail himself of the opportunity.

Mr. MADDEN. No one else has been objected to in this manner.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I would not like to object to the gentleman continuing, but the gentleman from Alabama, who is in charge of the bill, has declared it his purpose—

Mr. MADDEN. I only want five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman has spoken more than five minutes, has declined that the five-minute rule be extended, and in his absence I do not think the gentleman from Illinois ought to ask any further time.

Mr. MADDEN. I am not going to ask any further favors—

Mr. GUDGER. Mr. Chairman, I have objected.

Mr. MADDEN. I only want the same indulgence that has been accorded the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. GUDGER. I hope the other side will object to Mr. STANLEY or anybody else if they try to speak again.

Mr. MADDEN. All right; it will take more time, and if you are going to object we will show you how to object.

Mr. GUDGER. Then we will bring in a rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Bring in your rule; go ahead, bring it in.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. Does the gentleman from Illinois want five minutes?

Mr. MANN. I am going to ask that my colleague have five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. I submit that the colleague of the gentleman from Illinois has been discussing the question now for five minutes or more and I think we ought to proceed.

Mr. MANN. I am trying to proceed. The request was made to close debate in five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. Well, I will join the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that debate close in five minutes, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] to be recognized for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PALMER. That is, debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. On this paragraph and all amendments thereto. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I was saying when I was interrupted [laughter] that the time came when the sons of the men who came from the north of Europe left the lowly employments and went into other employments of life.

Then the Germans came on to the scene, and they took the places of these men who came from England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. They did this kind of work. They were not American citizens when they came, but their children grew, and they went to our schools and became American citizens; and in the process of evolution they left this kind of employment and became factors in the development of the great industrial institutions of this country, and they are potential factors in the life of the Nation to-day and among our best American citizens. Following them, the Swedes came, and the process of evolution went on exactly the same. Their children are doctors, and lawyers, and merchants, and bankers, and fill every other walk of life, and are doing the things that make for the best good of the people of this great Nation. Following them came the Poles, and the same process of evolution went on with them. Their sons and their daughters are influential factors in the life of this Nation. They are among the best American citizens. And following them were the men from the north of Italy, and the same thing went on with them, and their boys and girls grew into manhood and womanhood. They are American citizens, and they love our flag and our institutions and are as patriotic as any other of our citizens. [Applause.] Following them came the Austrians, and the same process of evolution went on with them, and their boys and girls are now men and women, are now American citizens, living under the protection of the American flag and ready to fight for the flag whenever need be. They are the men we have heard traduced as men who work in the lowly walks of life to-day. Some men must

do this work. Who is the American? What is the American? What did he come from that he has any special rights? How many men would be here to-day sitting on these seats if their fathers and mothers and grandfathers and grandmothers had not come from across the sea? Where did these men who are talking about Americans come from? What kind of meat do they eat that makes them so great? I want to say to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] and anybody else on this floor, that men coming from any part of Europe who are willing to work should be welcome to our shores. I have nothing to say of any man—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Do you include the Chinese?

Mr. MADDEN. I do not include the orientals, but I mean from any place in Europe, in all the Caucasian race, whether he is a south Italian or north Italian, an Irishman, an Englishman, a Scotchman, a Swede, a German, an Austrian, a Hungarian, or whatever he may be. And I want to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to you, gentlemen of this committee, that it is a slander upon the human race to say that because a man comes from some other country and can not speak the English language he is unworthy of consideration as a workman in the mines, in the fields, on the farm, and in the factories of the United States, where we need brain and brawn to create the wealth to push forward the great industrial development of which we are all so proud. [Loud applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

112. Steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms and slabs, die blocks or blanks, billets and bars, and tapered or beveled bars; mill shafting, pressed, sheared, or stamped shapes, not advanced in value or condition by any process or operation subsequent to the process of stamping; hammer molds or swaged steel; gun-barrel molds not in bars; all descriptions and shapes of dry sand, loam, or iron molded steel castings, sheets, and plates, if made by the Bessemer, Siemens-Martin, open-hearth, or similar processes, not containing alloys, such as nickel, chromium, tungsten or wolfram, molybdenum, titanium, iridium, uranium, tantalum, boron, and similar alloys, and steel not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem; steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms and slabs, die blocks or blanks; billets and bars and tapered or beveled bars; pressed, sheared, or stamped shapes not advanced in value or condition by any process or operation subsequent to the process of stamping; hammer molds or swaged steel; gun-barrel molds not in bars; alloys used as substitutes for steel in the manufacture of tools; all descriptions and shapes of dry sand, loam, or iron molded castings, sheets, and plates; rolled wire rods in coils or bars not smaller than No. 6 wire gauge, and steel not specially provided for in this section, all the foregoing when made by the crucible, electric, or cementation process, either with or without alloys, and finished by rolling, hammering, or otherwise, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 29, line 19, after the word "shafting," strike out the comma and insert a semicolon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 29, line 24, after the word "plates," strike out the comma and insert "; all the foregoing."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I also offer a further amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 1, after the word "nickel," insert the words "cobalt, vanadium."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment. The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers a further amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 3, strike out the words "and steel not specially provided for in this section."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 17, after the word "otherwise," insert the words "and all steels by whatever process made containing alloys such as nickel, cobalt, vanadium, chromium, tungsten, wolfram, molybdenum, titanium, iridium, uranium, tantalum, boron, and similar alloys."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, what rates do those now bear, according to the bill?

Mr. PALMER. Under the present law?

Mr. MANN. Under the present law and according to the bill as it stood before.

Mr. PALMER. I will say this to the gentleman in explanation: We have made a new classification in this paragraph for crucible steels, giving them a rate of 5 per cent higher than the Bessemer or open-hearth steels.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PALMER. Just a moment. Under the present law the equivalent ad valorem rates are about 22 per cent on all the products covered by this paragraph. However, the crucible-steel products are such a small proportion of the total of imports that the 22 per cent is not a fair statement of the real equivalent ad valorem on the crucible steels, which is very much higher. Therefore, in writing this paragraph we have reduced the rate on Bessemer and open-hearth steel covered by the paragraph from about 22 per cent to 10 per cent, and on the crucible steels from something higher than 22 per cent—it is impossible to say just what—to 15 per cent.

Now, the effect of the amendments which I have just offered is simply to make certain that purpose of making this difference in classification between open-hearth Bessemer steels on the one hand and crucible steels or alloy steels on the other.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not a fact that on most of the articles mentioned in this paragraph the duty has been increased over the bill of last year from 10 to 15 per cent?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, no. The bill of last year carried this paragraph at 10 per cent.

Mr. ANDERSON. It now carries it at 15 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. Not at all. The bill carries the Bessemer or open-hearth or ordinary process steel at 10 per cent, the same as last year, and those are the preponderating imports and manufactures of steel, as any gentleman who has given the matter investigation will show you, while the crucible steels, of which about 100,000 tons are produced in the United States per annum, are reduced to 15 per cent.

Mr. ANDERSON. But they are increased in the bill of a year ago.

Mr. PALMER. The crucible steels are higher than in the bill of a year ago, but the gentleman said we were increasing all the articles covered in this paragraph.

Mr. ANDERSON. I said most of them.

Mr. PALMER. That is a mistake. The crucible steels are a very small proportion of the articles covered by this paragraph.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. ANDERSON. The paragraph just read and the one that follows afford additional evidence of the eleventh-hour conversion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] to protective ideas. The gentleman himself admits that some proportion at least of the articles named in the paragraph just read have been increased from 10 to 15 per cent. On paragraph 113, which follows, the duty has been increased to 20 per cent. On articles mentioned in paragraph 114, grit, shot, and so forth, the duty has been increased from 20 per cent in the Underwood bill of the last Congress to 30 per cent in the pending bill. I am not complaining about the conversion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. My regrets are directed to the fact that his conversion, tending toward the protective tariff, has not included the agricultural schedule. I had hoped that it might extend to some of the products raised in the great Northwest. My regret is that the gentleman seems to have greater consideration for the Steel Trust and the steel industry than he has for the agricultural interests of the great Northwest. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 30, line 17, by inserting after the words "ad valorem" a semicolon and the following: "Provided, That none of the articles herein specified shall be admitted to the United States until it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that the foreign labor employed in the production or manufacture thereof shall have been paid wages equal to wages paid for similar labor in the United States."

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that amendment that it is not germane to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes a point of order against the amendment of his colleague [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, that amendment is in different form from the one upon which the Chair ruled yesterday, and it is made pertinent to the paragraph itself. I think it is entirely in order, and I would like to discuss it for a moment, if the Chair cares to have me do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. MOORE. The paragraph fixes tariff rates upon steel ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs, and so forth, and other products of iron and steel, with a view to protecting their manufacture in the United States; or, rather, with a view to raising revenue for the Government of the United States. The amendment which I have offered proposes to put a limitation upon the kind of commodities that may come into the United States as provided in the paragraph. I assume it is within the province of the House to say that if the wages paid for the manufacture of iron and steel products in the United States are twice or three times as high as the wages paid for similar labor in foreign countries that goods shall not be admitted in competition with the labor of the United States, if the foreign wages paid were less.

The purpose of this amendment is so to define the law that a Secretary of the Navy, for instance, who gives instructions by direction of Congress to an American manufacturer of iron and steel that he must limit the hours of labor to eight, may, by the same token, be permitted to say to a foreign manufacturer who is competing with the American laborer that the wages paid for the product which it is proposed to put into the ships of the United States or any other commodity of the United States shall conform to the American wage.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair ruled yesterday afternoon on a proposition very similar to this. Whether or not there is a place in the bill where this might be in order, the Chair will not undertake to say at this time; but the Chair holds that it is not germane to this paragraph and sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

115. Rivet, screw, fence, nail, and other iron or steel wire rods, whether round, oval, or square, or in any other shape, and flat rods up to 6 inches in width ready to be drawn or rolled into wire, all the foregoing in coils or otherwise, including wire rods and iron or steel bars, cold rolled, cold drawn, cold hammered, or polished in any way in addition to the ordinary process of hot rolling or hammering, 10 per cent ad valorem; *Provided*, That all round iron or steel rods smaller than No. 6 wire gauge shall be classed and dutiable as wire.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 25, insert after the word "wire" the words "or strips."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

116. Round iron or steel wire; wire composed of iron, steel, or other metal, except gold or silver, covered with cotton, silk, or other material; corset clasps, corset steels, dress steels, and all flat wires and steel in strips not thicker than No. 15 wire gauge and not exceeding 5 inches in width, whether in long or short lengths, in coils or otherwise, and whether rolled or drawn through dies or rolls, or otherwise produced; telegraph, telephone, and other wires and cables composed of metal and rubber, or of metal, rubber, and other materials; iron and steel wire coated by dipping, galvanizing, or similar process with zinc, tin, or other metal; all other wire not specially provided for in this section and articles manufactured wholly or in chief value of any wire or wires provided for in this section; all the foregoing, 20 per cent ad valorem; wire heddles and healds, 25 per cent ad valorem; wire rope, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 31, line 22, after the words "ad valorem," at the end of paragraph 116, insert the following: "Fourdrinier wires and bronze, brass, or copper wire cloth, partly or wholly manufactured, 45 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, yesterday we heard a good deal said by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON] about this tariff bill not being prepared in behalf of the manufacturing interests of the country. I wish to submit that, in connection with the amendment I have offered, it is not prepared in behalf of the laboring people of this country. It happens that in my district there are two mills making what is known as Fourdrinier wire or wire cloth used in paper manufacturing. I was waited on last week by representatives of the American Wire Weavers' Protective Association. They are laboring men who work at the loom making that wire cloth, and they ask that the present rate of duty on wire products be retained, in order that they may maintain their families and homes in this country and not be obliged to submit to the rivalry and competition of England and France in their line of employment. They are a high-grade class of working people. I have letters here showing the way in which they stand with their employers. They have not asked in 25 years for any increase of wage. They are receiving on an average about \$4 per day, or \$25 per week, in comparison with the same class of work in England at \$10 to \$12 per week and in Germany at \$6 to \$7 per week. It is impossible for the rates of wages which are now being paid to continue at any less duty than now appears under the basket clause in this schedule. Consequently I ask that the rate be restored on this wire-cloth manufacture, that these men may continue to receive employment at home.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield? I would like to ask him why they pay so much more in England than they do in Germany?

Mr. TREADWAY. I can not yield; I have only five minutes. The wage in this country, as I have stated, is \$25 per week and in Germany for the same class of work the employees receive \$6 to \$7 per week. Now, at an average price of 22 cents per square foot, which 60-mesh wire costs, the laboring man has 50 to 60 per cent, and as the fineness of the wire increases a greater proportion goes to the man at the loom. At the present rate of duty foreign competitors can undersell our manufacturers in the home market.

Yesterday there was adopted in the Massachusetts Legislature resolutions to this honorable body, not because the Democratic governor sent a special message to the legislature upon the subject of the tariff, but because just such industries as the one to which I now refer and hundreds of others in our State realize what the effect of the adoption of this bill will mean to the working men and women of the State. Massachusetts believes in the spirit of protection—protection to the laboring man—and it is on that account that they memorialize this Congress.

I desire, Mr. Chairman, if I may, to submit an extract from these resolutions, and I also desire to submit a brief that was submitted to the Ways and Means Committee by the American Wire Weavers' Protective Association, and also a letter from one of the manufacturers, in which he speaks of the standard of these employees. We ask, therefore, that the same rate of duty which applies to this line of goods be retained in the present bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The matters referred to are as follows:

PROTECTIVE TARIFF URGED—MASSACHUSETTS LEGISLATURE MEMORIALIZES CONGRESS AT REQUEST OF GOV. FOSS.

BOSTON, April 29.

In accordance with a request of Gov. Foss expressed in a special message, both branches of the legislature to-day adopted a resolution memorializing Congress. The resolution declares:

"That the policy of opening the markets of the United States to the unrestricted competition of the rest of the world, advocated by the President in his message and the pending bill, which is a long step toward the complete establishment of that policy, appears to the legislature to be in direct contravention of the wishes of the voters of the United States, and especially of this Commonwealth, as expressed in the last election."

It is urged that any tariff legislation should be based upon the protective principle, that a tariff commission of disinterested experts be re-established, and that reasonable opportunity be given those interested to be heard before final action is taken.

BRIEF OF THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE AMERICAN WIRE WEAVERS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION.

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., January 7, 1913.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We beg to file this statement with your honorable body in the name of the iron, bronze, copper and brass, and other kinds of wire-cloth weavers of the United States.

Understanding it to be the intention of the incoming Congress to revise the tariff schedules, we wish to urge for your consideration whatever claims our industry may have, if not to an increase, at least to a retention of the present duty.

We do not think it possible that there can be any reduction in the tariff on iron, bronze, copper and brass, and other kinds of wire cloth if your honorable body is made acquainted with the facts of this industry as we know them.

Any reduction at this time will be detrimental to the interests of every wire weaver in this country as well as to the interests of the large number of workers in the allied branches of the trade.

While the cost of living has increased, the wages of the wire weavers of America are lower to-day than they have been for 30 years, lower, in fact, than they have been since the establishment of this industry in the United States; as a direct result of the importation of wire cloth from abroad a reduction of wages amounting to 20 per cent has been made necessary within the past year.

Even under the present tariff many American wire weavers have been thrown out of employment by reason of German manufacturers finding a market for iron, bronze, copper and brass, and other kinds of wire cloth in the United States. There has been a considerable increase in these importations within the past year, making employment in some American factories less certain than formerly.

The wire weavers in Germany work 60 hours per week. This is 10 hours per week longer than the American is required to work in the same line. There can be no comparison between the wages paid to the German wire weavers, a statement of which is herewith appended, and those received by the weavers in this country for the same grade and class of work. Even taking into consideration any possible difference in the cost of living in Germany, as compared with the United States, the German wire weaver works for a wage so low that his standard of living can not approximate to that deemed necessary for the American mechanic.

Under the present tariff, the German wire-cloth manufacturer is able to place his finished product in the American market at a price lower than his American competitor. We think any reduction in the tariff would give the German an unfair advantage. We believe it would mean discrimination against American labor, and tend to discourage the investment of capital in home enterprise.

Again, we may cite the condition of the British wire-cloth manufacturer. While they have not been of any great injury to the American wire-cloth manufacturer, this possibly being due to the present rate of 45 per cent duty, and also to their higher rate of wages paid the British weaver over that of their German competitor, yet they, too, may become as serious a menace to the American manufacturer should a reduction of the tariff take place. We submit, herewith, a statement showing the rate of wages paid by the British manufacturer as compared with the American manufacturer.

We know that you will not purposely retard the growth of any legitimate interest in our country, but as our product does not seem to be specifically classified under the present law it has seemed to us necessary to draw it to your attention in this way. We think you would be encouraging American labor as well as American capital in this case by protecting us against unfair foreign competition.

If such encouragement is to be given we urge you, if you do not recommend an increase in the duty, to see that the present tariff is maintained. We would not ask that this statement be filed if we were not fully convinced that a reduction in the tariff on iron, bronze, copper and brass, and other kinds of wire cloth, would be detrimental to the workers in whose interests we write and tend to interfere with the growth of a legitimate American industry.

We have been given repeated assurances that no reduction in the tariff will be made by Congress if it can be shown that such a change will discourage the normal growth of legitimate business enterprises.

We do not know, of course, that any change is contemplated in the case of iron, bronze, copper and brass, and other kinds of wire cloth. If any such change may be contemplated, we beg your honorable committee to give us an opportunity of acquainting you with whatever facts we possess when the schedule is taken up.

Thanking you in anticipation of a careful perusal of the statements herein set forth, we beg to remain,

Yours, very respectfully,

AMERICAN WIRE WEAVERS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION.
E. E. DESMOND,
Secretary-Treasurer, 27 Woodland Avenue, Woodhaven, N. Y.
JOSEPH O'NEIL, 31 Brown Avenue, Holyoke, Mass.
PATRICK A. WATERS, 20 Bayard Street, Belleville, N. J.

NATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE
AMERICAN WIRE WEAVERS' PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
Holyoke, Mass., April 4, 1913.

HON. ALLEN T. TREADWAY, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter to Mr. Fred Childs, which he handed to me with request that I reply to the same, I beg to say that the brief filed by our committee at the time of hearing by the Ways and Means Committee covers the matter, and to which you have access.

Trusting that things will turn out better than we expect, and thanking you for any efforts you may have put forth in our behalf and for anything you may do in the future,

I am, very sincerely,

ARCHIBALD A. BROOKS.

LEE, MASS., March 20, 1913.

Mr. ALLEN T. TREADWAY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. TREADWAY: I received your letter of the 15th instant, in regard to the tariff, and am sending you herewith some figures and statements. I trust you will do your best for me regarding this matter, and appreciate your kindness in sending me the letter.

The wire manufacturers do not mean to be selfish or unjust in asking that the duty on our particular product remain, at least, where it is without any reduction. At present under the latest tariff ruling, the manufacturers of brass-wire cloth are protected by a duty of 45 per cent. This may seem like a very large duty, but it is warranted by the difference in labor conditions. We, with other manufacturers, have figured very carefully the cost of making the brass-wire cloth that we furnish our customers, and at the present price of copper, which is about a normal price, find that what we call No. 60 actually costs us from 21 cents to 21½ cents per square foot. Our customers use these grades of cloth in about four different meshes, No. 60, No. 65, No. 70, and No. 80. The No. 60 furnishes a fair illustration. As stated above, with very careful figuring we find that it costs us 21 cents to 21½ cents, and is sold to our trade in no case over 24 cents, and very frequently sold at 23 cents to 23½ cents. This cost mentioned above does not figure any rebates for poor service, which is one of the sources of complaint and which we can not seem to overcome in any way. This alone adds about 2½ per cent to 3 per cent to our cost of manufacture. Of our cost, our workmen get 50 per cent, or about 10 cents per square foot on the total of 21 cents to 21½ cents.

These men average \$25 per week, very frequently running up to \$35 and \$38 per week, not including overtime, simply straight time-work, very seldom going below \$15 or \$16. It is piecework, hence the difference in the wages.

In England the workmen get from \$10 to \$12 per week, and turn out practically the same amount as our own men. The looms are very similar in construction. In Germany, from which we have the strongest competition, the weavers get \$6 and \$7 per week. This enables the representatives of the German manufacturers to sell No. 60 wires in this country at 22 cents per square foot and pay freight, insurance, and 45 per cent duty. To-day the strongest competition is from Germany, and they are sending large quantities of their goods to this country. Our own workmen are getting the same wages that they have for the last 25 or 30 years. Never in all that time have they made any demands on us for increase as the cost of living has increased. For the most part they are steady, faithful men, and of a high order of intelligence and thrift.

The lowering of the duty, therefore, on our particular product would seem to indicate nothing but lower wages for them, or the stopping of some of the production in our line of goods in this country. If the lowering of the tariff reduces our income, as it necessarily must, and as the Government expects to tax incomes above a certain amount, it is simply losing this tax on incomes from the American manufacturer and encouraging the foreign manufacturer. We can not see it in any other way, that it seems to be helping the business of the English and German manufacturers at the expense of the American manufacturer.

If there was an enormous profit on our line of work, we might be able to stand something of a cut, but 8 per cent does not seem to us to be an excessive profit, and that 8 per cent is determined very largely on whether we get the highest or lowest price mentioned above. The manufacturer who makes his goods at a cost of 21½ cents and sells them at 23 cents is not making 8 per cent. It would seem to us, therefore, as though we really needed protection. We have taken No. 60 as an illustration, but the same truths apply to the other meshes.

Hoping your assistance will prove satisfactory to the trade, I remain,
Yours, very truly,

THISTLE WIRE WORKS,
GEORGE W. ROBERTS.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The question was taken, and the amendment was lost.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the paragraph, that I may ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] a question. I have had submitted to me a brief touching the telegraph, the telephone, and other wires. I am in ignorance on the subject of this paragraph, upon what is known as telegraph and telephone wire. Will the gentleman please tell me whether or not a telegraph or telephone wire covered with lead is included in this paragraph?

Mr. PALMER. I would say that it was.

Mr. BUTLER. I am asking for the gentleman's best impression, because I know that he is familiar with it. It seems to me that it is. I understand that such a wire covered with lead will have on it a duty of 20 per cent?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I would like to inquire why smooth wire is put on the dutiable list while wire nails and barbed wire is on the free list?

Mr. PALMER. We made the distinction very largely because, following the bill of a year and a half ago known as the farmers' free-list bill, we wanted, where we could, to write a tariff bill in such a way as would bring the benefits of the reduction close home to the people. We know of nothing in the agricultural section of the country that is of more general use than this kind of wire and wire fencing and other articles the gentleman names which we have put on the free list. It is in the interest of the consumer.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand the gentleman perfectly. It is because they put it on the free list a year ago that they now wish to put barbed wire and nails on the free list as a bid for the farmers' vote.

Mr. PALMER. The country has approved of what we did in that matter [applause on the Democratic side], and we think they will approve of it again.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Oh, no; the country has not approved of that at all. The majority was against you; and the farmers are not clamoring for anything of that kind. This is simply another instance of the rule which has been applied in a number of instances throughout this bill, where you have put a duty on the partly finished product and let the completed article made from it bear a higher duty. Barbed wire is so cheap now that the farmer never thinks anything about it, and nails are so cheap that a man can not afford to stop and pick up one when he drops it, and both of them have been made so by the application of the principle of protection and the protective tariff that has been put on these products by the Republican Party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this bill it puts nail rods on the dutiable list, and nails made from nail rods on the free list. Am I correct?

Mr. PALMER. Nails are on the free list.

Mr. MANN. Nails are on the free list. I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read in my time letters from an independent manufacturing concern located in my district, which makes tacks, nails, etc., as to the justice of the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRAND CROSSING TACK CO.,
Grand Crossing, Ill., April 19, 1913.

HON. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANN: The tariff bill as introduced by Mr. UNDERWOOD on April 7, 1913, which you so kindly sent to me, has been received, and I just wish to offer a few comments that may be of more or less interest to you.

When this bill reaches the House the first move the Republicans should make as soon as they have the opportunity would be to amend its title by calling it a bill to perpetuate the trusts by insuring their great solidity and power to monopolize, and then pass the bill just as it stands, which would give the country an everlasting monument of Democratic stupidity and wise statesmanship. This may seem sarcastic, but the real facts as they exist in the bill will demonstrate that it is no idle talk, as it is well illustrated in the iron and steel schedule and free-list section.

Ask Mr. UNDERWOOD or any of his Democratic colleagues, or even the President himself, who in all logical reason of all the producers in this country of tacks, cut nails, wire nails, brads, staples, barbed wire, galvanized fence wire and wire fence, is the best able to stand competition against the world? Is it the ones who have their iron ore and coal mines, steamship and transportation companies, and blast furnaces in which they can smelt the ore, and coal dug from their own mines, and the same raw material brought in from other countries free of duty, or is it the hundred or more small producers of the above-named articles, whose raw material is either pig iron and scrap, or billets and sheet bars, or wire rods, or plain wire or sheets, who have been struggling for years in competition with the trust against the natural advantage the larger concern has over them in their cheap raw material and the cost of converting that raw material to the point where the small concern goes into the market and buys his raw material and then finishes the conversion and finally goes into competition with them to sell the finished product to the consumers? There is only one answer—the trust. And now the Government by the proposed bill is going to add another burden to the small concern by taking away all of his possibilities of profit by putting the above-named finished articles on the free list, leaving him to the mercy of the competition of the world in addition to his competition with the trust, and takes away all of the chance he might have to survive by leaving his raw material on the dutiable list with a duty of 8 per cent to 15 per cent, and depriving him of the chance of the world's free competition in buying these articles which are his raw material.

Surely this bill could be rightfully christened a bill to league the Government in helping the trust to crush all competition, because that is what the passage of this bill will do in effect, and the facts bear out the argument; and if what I have said is not enough, look up and figure out what effect the proposed changes on ferromanganese and ferrosilicon will bear on this subject, as well as the proposed duties on zinc in pigs, known in the market as spelter. From every angle that I can study the bill from the facts which I know, they all point to the same common end—trust advantage, small manufacturers' disadvantage.

Kindly plead with the dominant party to give us small manufacturers at least an even chance by taking off the free list paragraphs 562 and 649 and give them a duty commensurate with the duty on kindred articles and the semiraw material out of which these articles are made. If this can not be done, then be fair with us by giving us free trade on those semiraw iron and steel articles, which are our raw material, by putting on the free list pig iron and scrap, ferromanganese, ferrosilicon, found in paragraph 106; ingots, blooms, slabs, billets, and bars, found in paragraph 114; sheets of iron or steel, common or black, skelp, iron or steel, found in paragraph 109; rivet, screw, fence, nail, and other iron or steel wire rods, round, in coils, found in paragraph 115, and all of paragraphs 166 and 167. They can not be fair and just to us small manufacturers who are trying to compete against the so-called Iron and Steel Trust, who own their own raw material in the ground, unless they give us at least one or the other of the above propositions.

I fully realize the conditions as they now exist in Washington and the very slim chances that there are of any changes being made in the proposed tariff bill which is now before the Democratic caucus, but at the same time I wish to set the facts forth as they actually are and leave it to you to use them in any way that you may see fit, with the small hopes that possibly something might be done to help us out in some way.

Thanking you for the attention that I know you will give to the subject, I am,

Yours, very truly,

O. N. HUTCHINSON.

GRAND CROSSING TACK CO.,
Grand Crossing, Ill., January 9, 1913.

HON. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANN: I wish to lay before you an argument prepared by Mr. William F. Donovan, president of the Atlas Tack Co., Fairhaven, Mass., in reference to the proposed new tariff bill in reference to tacks and small cut nails. I have read over this document, and I can give it my hearty indorsement. He seems to have stated nothing but facts, and has put them in a very terse manner.

Of course, we presume it is hardly possible that any argument or facts that we can bring forth will have any influence upon the dominant party. Be that as it may, however, we believe it is advisable to file just as vigorous a protest as we possibly can, and we ask you to do everything in your power to that end.

We sincerely hope that through their errors the business interests of this country will come back to their own again in a very short time.

Yours, very truly,

O. N. HUTCHINSON.

JANUARY —, 1913.

Sir: At a recent conference of the manufacturers of tacks and small nails relating to the proposed new tariff bill, it was shown that any further reduction of the duty on this class of products would result in

very great hardship to the manufacturers of this country, and in all probability in the importation of foreign goods to an extent which would put many of those exclusively engaged in that line out of business or compel a reduction in wages, which does not seem desirable, feasible, or even possible.

It became evident that even in the tariff bill of 1909 an unjust discrimination was made against this class of products, and we were only saved from foreign importations under the existing duty because of the extremely low prices which have prevailed until very recently in the cost of raw material in this country, and the almost destructive competition which has existed in our home trade.

We therefore appeal to your sense of justice and your known desire to be of service to your constituents in all proper ways to give us the benefit of such assistance as we feel sure you can render in insuring proper consideration being given to this class of product by those concerned in the revision of the tariff which is now being undertaken, and upon which hearings will be held before the Ways and Means Committee on the 10th instant.

Briefly stated, the facts, as they apply to our industry, are as follows:

In the revision of 1909, notwithstanding the protests of all the manufacturers engaged in producing this class of goods, the duty upon them was reduced one-half, or from 1½ cents per pound to five-eighths cent per pound on the smaller sizes, and from 1½ cents per pound on the larger sizes to three-fourths cent per pound, while on the plate and sheets from which tacks and small nails are made the duty of one-half cent per pound was retained (sec. 125, Schedule C), thus leaving only from one-eighth cent to one-fourth cent as proportion to labor on the manufactured tacks, which is approximately 60 per cent of the material cost, the protection to labor being, therefore, only 11 per cent of the average labor cost, while the raw material is protected to 27 per cent of its total cost.

Surely this shows unjust discrimination, and it is further shown in the existing tariff by the duty which is carried on other manufactured articles involving a much smaller percentage of labor, such, for example, as rivets (sec. 165, Schedule C), which are given a protection of 1½ cents per pound, or 52.7 per cent of the labor cost, while the rivet rods from which these rivets are made are protected only to the extent of three-tenths cent per pound.

Iron and steel wood screws, in section 167, Schedule C, are given a protection of from 8 cents to 12 cents per pound on the lengths which correspond to the lengths in which tacks are made, an average of 10 cents per pound protection on these sizes of iron and steel wood screws. The screw wire rods from which the screws are made pay a duty of only three-tenths cent per pound under provisions of section 133 of Schedule C, thus giving a protection of \$9.67 per 100 pounds to the labor of making steel wood screws, or approximately 37 per cent.

These comparisons are made, not for the purpose of trying to show that the other products referred to are unduly protected, but as a basis for an inquiry as to why the tack manufacturer should be the "goat."

What the present views of the Ways and Means Committee may be in this connection we, of course, can not say; but assuming that the bill which passed the House of Representatives on January 29, 1912—H. R. 18642—represents its views, a still further injustice would be done to the tack-making industry, as that act placed tacks upon the free list, while a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem is retained upon the raw material from which tacks are made.

Consular report issued by the Bureau of Manufactures under date of June 19, 1912, gives the price of fine sheets in Germany on January 1, 1912, as from \$33.32 to \$34.51. Allowing the American differentials for sheets of heavier gauge—sheets gauging from 17 to 21, which are used in tack making—would make the price for such sheets \$29.32 as against the lowest price quoted in this country, for the last 10 years at least, of \$31. With tacks upon the free list, the German tack manufacturer, buying his raw material at a price lower than it has been sold in this country under the severest competition and with labor at little more than one-half the cost in this country, would only have the freight against him—approximately 10 cents per cubic foot from Antwerp to New York—or not to exceed \$2.75 per ton C. I. F., while the American manufacturer will have, in trying to import his raw material, a duty of 15 per cent ad valorem—approximately \$4.65, the importer's profit, if only 5 per cent—of \$1.55, the freight and insurance of \$2.75, making a net handicap of \$6.20 per ton, even if it were possible for a small tack manufacturer in this country to keep himself supplied with this long-distance material, which could only be done in the event of importers carrying a stock in this country to meet his requirements, in which event, of course, the allowance made for the importer's profit would have to be largely increased, and the fact that such stocks would be carried in this country is so improbable that it is not worthy of consideration.

The German tack manufacturer would therefore have an advantage over the American manufacturer of \$6.20 plus the difference in labor, which, assuming the German labor to be 60 per cent of the American labor cost, would give the American tack manufacturer a further handicap of at least \$12 per ton, or a total of \$18.20 per ton—equal to 18 per cent—in the presence of which he could not continue to exist.

What is true of Germany is true of France and Belgium likewise, particularly the latter.

Tack plates and sheets are now being made in Canada, where, again, we are confronted with cheaper labor, and it is certain that the American market will receive the surplus products of the Canadian tack manufacturers in the event of tacks being placed on the free list, unless the market is occupied with other foreign products, while the American manufacturers can not indulge in reprisals, owing to the heavy Canadian duty.

In view of these facts, are we not entitled to better consideration, and will you not render us such assistance as you can in seeing that our business receives it?

Respectfully, yours,

WM. F. DONOVAN.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

121. Finished automobiles and automobile bodies, 45 per cent ad valorem; automobile chassis, 30 per cent ad valorem; finished parts of automobiles, not including tires, 20 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This paragraph offers a very good example of the mental gymnastics necessary to write a bill of this character. The present law provides for a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem upon automobiles and finished parts alike. The pending bill reduces the duty on the finished parts from 45 to 20 per cent, thus increasing the protection of the assembler in a very

large degree. The only result of this situation will be to increase the importation of the finished parts of automobiles from foreign countries so that they can be assembled in this country and offered for sale in competition with the finished automobile here. The result will be inevitably a taking away from the American workman of work involved in the making and finishing of these parts. I think that the duty on automobiles might very properly be reduced. I think that the duty upon the finished parts might very properly be reduced, but it is impossible for me to understand the mental gymnastics that justify the increasing of the protection upon automobiles by 30 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, it would not be difficult for the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] to understand this change in the rates if he would take the time and the trouble to study the question of the automobile industry, both at home and abroad, as it has been studied by the Ways and Means Committee in connection with the drawing of this bill. Under the present law automobiles pay a rate of 45 per cent. That is not a high rate or an unconscionable rate, from our point of view, for a foreign luxury such as one of these automobiles.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Not at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman knows of the export of automobiles.

Mr. PALMER. Yes. Mr. Chairman, the kind of automobiles that that duty covers is not the cheap automobile, but the high-priced car. The average unit of value of imports of automobiles exceeds \$2,000. The only kind which come into the country are the high-priced cars, purchased by people of large means, who get the car because it is a foreign car and because they want to make a show before their neighbors and friends by having a Fiat or a Mercedes or some other famous foreign car.

We left that duty just where it is, but we did reduce the duty on the parts, because we believe that, while 45 per cent is a proper duty for an article of luxury purchased by the rich, it is not a proper rate of duty in view of the other rates in this bill upon an article which is largely a raw material of a great industry in this country. The fact is that the American manufacturer of automobiles uses foreign parts to a great extent, and we by making this rate 20 per cent are keeping it in line with other semiraw material used by manufacturing industries in the country. There is no danger whatever, and all automobile manufacturers and importers acknowledge that—the gentleman from Minnesota could find it out if he would take the trouble to read the hearings—there is no danger that the foreign automobiles will be imported as knocked-down cars in order to get rid of this 45 per cent rate. These parts come in as parts, and never come in as a knocked-down car, because the imported car that the American buys abroad he buys because he wants it, and he wants it because he is getting an automobile made in Europe which bears the foreign mark and the name. He does not care anything about having foreign parts in his car; he does not care anything about having a foreign wheel or a foreign axle. What he wants is a foreign car, and the reason these foreign cars come in at this excessive, this large, rate of 45 per cent is because the rich American is willing to pay any price in order to show himself off to his neighbors and his friends.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. I will yield if I have the time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Does not the gentleman know that under this provision it would be possible to import an entire automobile exclusive of the tires at 20 per cent ad valorem?

Mr. PALMER. No; it would not be done.

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, it can be done, can it not?

Mr. PALMER. The automobile chassis, which the gentleman from Minnesota must know, is practically the finished car with the exception of the top and the tires, comes in at 30 per cent. The automobile parts which would be imported under the Treasury definitions and the definitions of the courts are such parts as are capable of being used in manufacture here or in repair of local cars. The experts in the import offices would have little difficulty, it seems to me, in noting the difference between parts sent in to repair a car or parts of a car which had been made, manufactured, completed, and then taken apart and knocked down. The whole answer to it lies in the fact that there is no incentive to that kind of an importation because the finished car is what the American wants.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the peculiar features of this bill. Automobiles now pay 45 per cent duty, which is a prohibitory duty in the main, absolutely prohibitory as to all except a few high priced and in the main French cars. It is easy enough to carry out the provisions of this bill, 45 per cent

on those cars, without carrying a prohibitory rate on the poor man's car, and it will not do any longer to say that automobiles are only for the rich. Even Members of this House who are not rich are able to own automobiles, and many of their constituents, with an annual earning of less than one-tenth of a Congressman's salary, own automobiles. But here is a prohibitory tariff, absolutely prohibitory on all of the cheap automobiles, direct in the face of the statement which has been made by the gentleman from Alabama as to the theory of this tariff. We imported less than \$2,000,000 worth of automobiles last year. We exported over \$9,000,000 worth, and the amount produced in the United States and consumed was \$165,000,000 worth of production, and yet the gentlemen say in making up a competitive tariff that they must keep the price of automobiles up to a 45 per cent ad valorem rate. I am prepared to say that there would be due protection to the American industry with a considerable reduction in price. Automobiles have become a necessity in the land. For many years the price naturally was high because it was controlled by patents, but the time has come when automobiles ought to be made cheap in competition with the ordinary cheap buggies. No longer do people possess carriages, buggies, and horses to the extent they did formerly, but they now want to get automobiles. Here is a proposition which proposes to keep the rate now the same rate that has been on for years on automobiles, a prohibitory rate on all except the highest priced machines.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. PALMER. I want to say to the gentleman this is the fact about the automobile business: That the finer, the high priced, the luxurious cars come in as finished automobiles—

Mr. MANN. Well, the gentleman said that before.

Mr. PALMER. Wait a minute. On them we lay a duty of 45 per cent. The cheaper cars which are imported for use here, the trucks, the commercial cars, all come in as chassis at 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. But we export finished automobiles of that character, as the gentleman well knows. I have no objection to making the tariff rate 50 per cent or 60 per cent on machines that cost over \$1,000 or \$1,500.

But why is that a reason for maintaining 45 per cent on machines which sell for less than \$1,000 and cost less than \$300 to make. The automobile business is now maintaining the newspapers of the country through advertising. It is doing a large amount of expensive work in every direction in that way. The same thing that applied to sewing machines at one time, which sold from \$75 to \$150 per machine because of patented processes, now applies to automobiles under this provision in the bill. I say the tariff rate ought to be reduced on automobiles, so that there would be some competition, and that people might have machines. It would not injure an industry in this country.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the arguments which I have just heard from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] illustrate the united position the Republican Party occupies to-day on the tariff question. We have just heard an eloquent and able speech from the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], a member of the Ways and Means Committee, charging us with the fact that this violent reduction of rates on automobiles was going to destroy the business, and, on the other hand, the leader of the Republican Party, in the next breath, comes up here and tells us that we have written a prohibitive rate on automobiles, which will destroy the American people. Now, there you are. Take your choice on each side of the Republican Party, a gentleman who says that it will destroy industry, and a gentleman who says at the same time the prohibitive rate is ruining the American people.

As a matter of fact, the automobile is the chassis. The balance is merely a carriage top. We have reduced the rate very considerably on the automobile—that is, the chassis—which means the entire car except the carriage part, the top of it, and the rubber tires. We have reduced it from 45 per cent to 30 per cent, a reduction of one-third. Now, as to the top, it is the cheaper part of an automobile, for the use of an ordinary man, a man of reasonable means. Of course, for the luxuriant rich the limousine top may cost a great deal of money, and it is that kind of a top, that kind of seating arrangement, that we are going to tax, and keep the tax of 45 per cent on. If a man wants to come over here and ride in a French car and display his wealth to his friends, he ought to pay for it, and he is going to pay for it under this bill. But when you can bring into this country at 30 per cent, a reduction of a third, the well-made, well-manufactured chassis, the working part of the car, it is not going to destroy the business as our friend from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] suggests, but it is going to bring real competition to

the American manufacturers of automobiles, because it will build up an industry among those men who import the chassis, put an American top to it, and it brings real competition that will bring down the price of the home-made article.

Mr. Chairman, I ask to close debate on this paragraph.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman permit me just a few minutes?

Mr. SIMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will first yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SIMS. It puts 40 per cent on motor cycles. I did not understand those to be a matter of luxury, but rather for utilitarian purposes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. One of my boys owns two of them, and I think they are a matter of nuisance more than anything else.

Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on the paragraph in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] is recognized.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, the business of manufacturing automobiles in the State of Michigan is a very important one. There are establishments in the city of Detroit and other cities in Michigan which employ from 5,000 to 8,000 high-class laboring men. By high-class men I mean mechanics who receive a high rate of wages, from \$5 to \$10 and \$12 a day.

A few days ago a gentleman gave me a ride in a very magnificent automobile, and when returning to the hotel, he said, "What do you think of my automobile?" He told me it was a French machine, for which he had paid \$8,700.

Now, poor people do not own machines of that kind, and I do not care how high you put the duty on that class of luxury. I would like to see it sufficiently high so that all such machines that are used in this country will be made in this country and made by American laboring men, at the scale of wages paid in those factories here in the United States. In this bill you put a rate of duty on the finished parts of an automobile, not including tires, of 20 per cent ad valorem. The finished parts of automobiles means that the machine will be finished abroad and brought here to be assembled.

There are but few people who are to-day classed as poor people who own automobiles.

I saw a notice in a paper the other day to the effect that a farmer living in the State of Illinois, Mr. MANN's State, brought to market 12 hogs in an automobile and took home in return \$480 in cash.

Mr. MANN. The farmers all own automobiles in my State. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes; they are all wealthy—the farmers—

Mr. MANN. Under the present laws.

Mr. FORDNEY. Under the present laws and the general prosperity that we have enjoyed during the last 16 years the farmers, not only of Illinois, but elsewhere, are rich. I want to see them remain rich. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MADDEN. They have all got money in the bank. [Applause.]

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman that in my district I have a little town of 4,000 people, and most of them are farmers, and they told me that by actual count last fall over 300 automobiles were owned in that town.

Mr. FORDNEY. I have a letter which I will send to the Clerk's desk to have read when the matter comes up to which the letter is germane; a letter in which the person who writes it says that a few years ago he paid from 12½ to 15 cents a yard for ordinary calico for a dress for his wife, but that now his wife takes to market in an automobile one setting hen and can buy a silk dress with the proceeds thereof. [Laughter and applause.] That illustrates the difference between the values of farm products and manufactured products then and now. The point I wish to make, gentlemen, is that in reducing the duty from 45 per cent to 20 per cent on this item, if it will permit the importation of automobile parts, you will have then transferred the labor that is now employed in the automobile factories of this country to a foreign land, and to that I most strenuously object. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

122. Bicycles, 25 per cent ad valorem; motor cycles, and finished parts thereof, not including tires, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, if there is any industry in America that has demonstrated its ability to stand on its own feet, it is the automobile industry.

I have listened to a very remarkable statement here, made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY]. Detroit is prob-

ably the greatest automobile center in America. There is not a man possessed of ordinary business capacity who has gone into the automobile business in Detroit but has not only made a good living but has made in most instances a very great fortune; and if the gentleman will pick up any trade paper in this country or any trade paper published in France or in England he will find that the cheap American automobile has taken a large part of the market in England and in France.

Now, what happened was this: The people abroad were earlier than we in the building of automobiles; they built up an industry long before we did; and there was a time in this country when we were not able to make a machine that was anything like as good as the foreign machine. That time has long since passed, and American ingenuity, American skill, and American ability have, with high-priced American labor—in the sense that it was high-priced in the wage that it got, but was cheap in the work that it gave—have developed what is to-day the greatest automobile industry in the world; and if you had free trade in automobiles, in my judgment, you would not have any serious competition in the cheap automobile industry—in the automobiles that sell anywhere from \$750, like the Hupmobile, or similar cars, up to \$1,000 or \$1,500.

We to-day are making those machines better and cheaper than they are made anywhere else in the world, and it is simply folly, in the face of the actual facts, to talk about a threatened industry. Nothing is being threatened about it. There ought to be a tax on the higher priced cars. But, speaking for myself, I would not feel that there was the slightest risk to the industry as a whole if automobiles were put on the free list.

Let me ask the gentleman what has been the experience in the city of Detroit? How many multimillionaires have been made there, almost overnight, in the automobile industry?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not know. I am not in the business.

Mr. SHERLEY. I know, because I happen to know some of the men who have made the money. I am glad they have made it. But I know that there has not been a single concern, well managed, but has not only made a success but a success so great as to be the marvel of modern manufacturing enterprise.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. I know of one gentleman whom the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] knows very well, who by the fortunate investment of a few thousand dollars in an establishment making a very low-priced car, has to-day an annual income very much larger than either the gentleman or I receive for serving our country.

Mr. FORDNEY. Let me say to the gentleman that the only complaint I am making is that if by lowering the rate of duty from 45 to 20 per cent you encourage importation, then you have injured the industry, or the labor, by transferring it abroad; and if it will not do that, why lower the duty?

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course the gentleman and I can never meet upon common ground. He believes we ought to make it impossible for anybody to bring anything into this country. He believes it ought to be made a capital offense. He thinks America can go on selling to the rest of the world and never buying from it. I think it is time for these industries to get out of their swaddling clothes and to go out into the world's market and capture some of it.

Mr. FORDNEY. What you think "the gentleman" thinks, and what you know about what the gentleman thinks, may be two different things.

Mr. SHERLEY. Of course, for I am limited to what the gentleman says he thinks, and I may be wrong in my conclusion.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not think I have said anything from which you could draw such a conclusion.

Mr. SHERLEY. During my 10 years of service here the gentleman has stood as the champion of the highest protective tariff that could be written. To-day he is in constant quarrel with nearly every man on his own side, because some of them want to progress, and he wants to stand pat on the tariff.

Mr. FORDNEY. My friend, I always object to progressing as a crawfish does.

Mr. SHERLEY. Oh, yes; but perhaps the trouble may be in your vision rather than in the direction in which people are progressing.

Mr. FORDNEY. Perhaps.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman has stood on this floor talking about lumber, and he has the same sort of idea about that; whereas it is well known that every man who invested in standing timber as long as five years ago has had the benefit of such an increase in value as to amount to a great return upon the investment. Yet the gentleman thinks if you change a single rate touching lumber you are verily laying an impious hand on the ark of the covenant.

Mr. FORDNEY. Again you are asserting what the gentleman thinks, without knowing what he thinks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I will ask the gentleman in charge of this schedule of the bill for information concerning paragraph 122. I notice it provides for a duty on bicycles of 25 per cent ad valorem, and on motor cycles and finished parts thereof, not including tires, 40 per cent ad valorem. I wish to ask this question because I have a manufacturer back in my home town who asked me recently as to the provision of the present bill as it affects his bicycle-saddle business, the largest in the country, I believe. I notice that in referring to motor cycles it provides for 40 per cent ad valorem on the finished parts thereof, not including tires. Does that include the saddle used on a motor cycle?

Mr. PALMER. I should think so. That is a part of the motor cycle.

Mr. SHARP. Then how would it apply to bicycle saddles? Would it be 25 per cent ad valorem?

Mr. PALMER. The reason that language was not put in in reference to bicycles is that practically all of the parts of bicycles would come in under the basket clause at the same rate that bicycles carry, while as to motor cycles, the basket clause is lower than the motor-cycle rate. In other words, there is not the same necessity for putting it in as to bicycles that there is for putting it in as to motor cycles, because the basket clause and the bicycle rate are the same.

Mr. SHARP. But taking the saddle of the bicycle, would that receive an ad valorem protection of 25 per cent?

Mr. PALMER. No; saddles do not come in the basket clause of the metal schedule.

Mr. SHARP. Does the gentleman mean that bicycle saddles do not?

Mr. PALMER. Unless they are composed in chief value of metal. I am not prepared to say whether those saddles are composed in chief value of metal or in chief value of leather. They have both metal and leather in them.

Mr. SHARP. Turning over to page 114, paragraph 535, you provide for all leather not specially provided for in this section; and then in the latter part of that section you say:

Harness, saddles, and saddlery.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That means leather saddles.

Mr. SHARP. Is that broad enough to include bicycle saddles?

Mr. PALMER. It would if the saddle was composed wholly or in chief value of leather. In that case it comes in under the free list. If it is composed wholly or in chief value of metal it comes in the basket clause of the metal schedule.

Mr. SHARP. Would not the same statement apply where it is used for a motor cycle?

Mr. PALMER. I think not, because under that language it would be a finished part of the motor cycle.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I notice in lines 8 and 9, page 33, motor cycles are dutiable at 40 per cent and the finished parts of the motor cycles, not including tires, also at 40 per cent. In other words, so far as motor cycles and finished parts are concerned, the tariff is 40 per cent, whereas automobiles are dutiable at 45 per cent and the finished parts at 20 per cent. Why is that distinction made between automobiles and their finished parts and no distinction made between motor cycles and their finished parts?

Mr. PALMER. The finished parts of small machines are very much larger in value proportion of the finished article than the finished parts of large machines like automobiles. Therefore there is less logic in making parts come in at a less rate in motor cycles than in automobiles.

Mr. COOPER. I can not understand the logic of the gentleman's statement. I do not know why bringing in an automobile chassis and the finished parts of an automobile is not in effect bringing in the automobile itself. It can all be set up here.

Mr. PALMER. Is the gentleman asking me a question?

Mr. COOPER. I say I do not understand the logic of the gentleman's statement. I do not know why the finished parts of a motor cycle should be dutiable at the same rate—40 per cent—as the motor cycle itself, and that the finished parts of automobiles should be dutiable at 25 per cent less than completed automobiles.

Mr. PALMER. I have stated to the gentleman the reason that the committee had.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the two paragraphs, I think, will cause a serious commentary in the mind of any person. The gentleman from Wisconsin just endeavored to extract some in-

formation as to why there was a difference in theory between the two paragraphs, but I did not hear any reply which seemed at all satisfactory.

Mr. GARNER. We are not responsible for the gentleman's failure of mind.

Mr. MANN. Usually it is desirable to make finished parts pay a little higher duty than the entire assembled machine, because that causes the parts to be made here rather than abroad. But under the automobile paragraph itself it is to the interest of anyone to make the parts abroad, or have them made abroad and brought here. You can bring in an entire automobile, if knocked down, and that is the way they naturally will come in, at 20 and 30 per cent ad valorem instead of 45 per cent for the finished machine.

And yet when you get to motor cycles the rate on the finished machines is made at 40 per cent instead of 45 per cent, as it is on the finished automobile, and the rate on the finished parts is put at 40 per cent, and only 20 per cent on the finished parts of automobiles. No wonder the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not furnish an explanation. A man to understand that will have to eat a welsh rarebit and go to sleep. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

125. Bolts, with or without threads or nuts, or bolt blanks, finished hinges or hinge blanks, nuts, and washers, 15 per cent ad valorem; spiral nut locks and lock washers, whether of iron or steel, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 21, insert, after the word "bolts," the words "of iron or steel."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, line 22, insert, after the word "nuts," the words "or blanks."

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word; and, with the permission of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I want to ask him a question. I received a letter this morning from Dr. J. B. Mason, of London, Ky., who wants to know what tariff duties, if any, this bill carries on scientific and surgical instruments and equipment. He goes on further to state that it is his opinion that they are not manufactured in this country to any great extent.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania refuse to answer the question?

Mr. PALMER. Oh, no; I do not refuse. They are not in this schedule. I am trying to find them, and if the gentleman will read the bill he will find them.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I have read the bill, but I failed to find them.

Mr. PALMER. Is the gentleman talking about surgical instruments or surgical utensils?

Mr. POWERS. Surgical instruments and equipments and those used by dentists.

Mr. PALMER. Hospital utensils would come under paragraph 136, which is printed on page 36, while surgical instruments not specifically enumerated would, if made in chief value of the metals covered by the metal schedule, come in under the basket clause, at 25 per cent.

Mr. POWERS. Does paragraph 136 cover the instruments that dentists use in their profession?

Mr. PALMER. No; I would think not.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman's attention to page 120 of the bill, paragraph 587:

Professional books, implements, instruments, and tools of trade, occupation, or employment in the actual possession of persons emigrating to the United States owned and used by them abroad; but this exemption shall not be construed to include machinery or other articles imported for use in any manufacturing establishment.

I suppose that has reference to professional instruments.

Mr. POWERS. That is on the free list; but that only applies to instruments brought here and used by immigrants.

Mr. PALMER. That is for scientific, religious, literary, or experimental purposes.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to state that my constituents inform me that the instruments used by dentists are not manufactured in this country at all, or that virtually few of them are, and that the American dentists pay at least 100 per cent more for the equipment of their offices than do the German dentists. If that is true, a provision ought to be made letting those matters come in free of duty.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

126. Card clothing not actually and permanently fitted to and attached to carding machines or to parts thereof at the time of importation, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of drawing the attention of the committee once more to the protective-tariff tendencies of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER]. Under the bill of last Congress articles named in this paragraph were made dutiable at 30 per cent. They are dutiable in this bill at 40 per cent. It seems, however, that upon at least one class of the articles dutiable under this paragraph the gentleman from Pennsylvania has somewhat exceeded the speed limit. On card clothing manufactured with round iron or untempered round steel wire the duty under the present law amounts, in ad valorem equivalent, to 16.29 per cent, based on the importation of 1911. This paragraph increases that duty 250 per cent. That certainly ought to be satisfactory to any protectionist, even though he come from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PAYNE. But being in this bill it is a revision downward, nevertheless.

Mr. ANDERSON. Oh, yes; of course.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON]. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill why certain parts of this paragraph were eliminated in H. R. 3321 as against H. R. 10.

Mr. PALMER. Those words were simply descriptive in H. R. 10.

Mr. MURDOCK. That was the sole reason for their elimination?

Mr. PALMER. That is all. They got into H. R. 10 because following the language of the Payne bill the descriptive words were necessary by reason of the larger number of classifications, and when we put them all in at one rate, without any classification, it became unnecessary to have these descriptive words, and we dropped them out. It has no other effect.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota has several times adverted to the fact that rates of duty in this bill were raised over what they were in the Underwood bill passed in the Sixty-second Congress. If his judgment of my practice in regard to tariff making were to be taken at its full value in Pennsylvania, I would be popular with manufacturers, indeed.

But as they look at the facts and consider that which has been done by the Ways and Means Committee, I find I am somewhat unpopular in Pennsylvania with the manufacturers. Thanks to my friend from Minnesota, therefore, I expect to get it from both ends. I want to say to him now, to end this discussion once and for all, that this Schedule C carries every rate lower than the Payne tariff law, with two exceptions, and those are the ferromanganese item, which we have discussed before, gold and silver ware and gold and silver plated ware.

Mr. MANN. How about finished automobiles?

Mr. PALMER. Finished automobiles are the same in this law as the Payne law.

Mr. MANN. But not any lower.

Mr. PALMER. Well, I said we did carry two increases in this bill.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman said it carried lower rates in every case except two. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. Well—

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman amends that.

Mr. PALMER. I will amend that if the gentleman wants to be so accurate, and say there are two increases in this bill—I thought that is what I did say—over the Payne law, and those are the two I have mentioned. Every other item in the bill has a very considerable reduction below the Payne bill, so that the average reduction is from 34.35 per cent to about 20 per cent throughout the schedule. Now, the Underwood bill last year is somewhat different from this bill now, and there are just 11 increases in this schedule of the bill over the rates of the Underwood bill and 12 decreases in the rates of this bill under those of the Underwood bill; but on the whole this bill is lower than the bill of the Sixty-second Congress, as far as Schedule C is concerned. I have them here in a list and will publish in the RECORD the changes that have been made in this schedule from those in the same schedule of last year's bill in the Sixty-second Congress. Therefore, taking the schedule throughout, there is absolutely no truth in the insinuation or intimation that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] would throw out

that this bill indicates a tendency toward an upward scale in the making of a tariff from that of a year and a half ago. If he will be honest with the committee and with the House while he goes along and calls attention to these slight and inconsequential increases, he will call attention also to the fact of the large and considerable decreases which we have put in this law under those of the Underwood bill of a year ago. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit me, I desire to ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Referring to the statement just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] in contradiction of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], will the gentleman from Pennsylvania turn to page 100 of his report? Has the gentleman that page? Now I will ask the gentleman whether it is true that card clothing manufactured with round iron or untempered round steel wire is charged to-day a duty of 20 cents per square foot. Is that correct or not according to your report?

Mr. PALMER. That is right.

Mr. GARDNER. That is true. I understood the gentleman to say that is true?

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman can read as well as I can.

Mr. GARDNER. Very well. Under your new bill that same card clothing is charged 40 per cent ad valorem, and the gentleman from Minnesota declares that to be a rise in duty over the Payne law. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania deny that?

Mr. PALMER. Well, the rate on card clothing under the Payne law is nearly 60 per cent. The rate in this bill now is 40 per cent, but even at 60 per cent the fact is that there was very considerable competition, and that is the reason why we raised this rate slightly above the Underwood bill of a year ago.

Mr. GARDNER. I am afraid the gentleman did not understand my question. As an illustration, I singled out the first item in paragraph 145 of the Payne law, as did the gentleman from Minnesota. I referred to "card clothing * * * when manufactured with round iron or untempered round steel wire." The duty under existing law is 20 cents per square foot. In the pending bill you have raised the duty on that kind of card clothing to 40 per cent ad valorem. According to your figures on page 121 the average value of imported card clothing per square foot is 82½ cents. Consequently the 40 per cent ad valorem duty which you propose amounts to 33 cents per square foot. Unless it is denied that a duty of 33 cents per square foot is higher than a duty of 20 cents per square foot, it is evident that the gentleman from Minnesota was correct in his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

127. Cast-iron pipe of every description, 12 per cent ad valorem; cast-iron andirons, plates, stove plates, sadirons, tailor's irons, hatter's irons, and castings and vessels wholly of cast iron, including all castings of iron or cast-iron plates which have been chiseled, drilled, machined, or otherwise advanced in condition by processes or operations subsequent to the casting process but not made up into articles or finished machine parts; castings of malleable iron not specially provided for in this section; cast hollow ware, coated, glazed, or tinned, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, at the end of line 14, insert the words: "Not specially provided for in this section."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, if it would have done any good, I should have offered, and would hereafter offer, some amendments as we progress in the bill, raising the rate of duty proposed. I recognize the futility of offering amendments of that character in the present temper of the Democratic majority, and that the offering of such amendments would only consume much more time than would otherwise be spent. While I think that this bill will be very injurious to the business and other interests of the country, still I have never felt like prolonging agony beyond the time when it might be ended, and as we are to have the passage of the tariff bill through the House in the present form substantially, with a reasonable discussion which so far, I think, has been allowed, the sooner the better. This

item reduces very materially the rate of duty on chains, and I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to be read in my time a letter from one of the prominent men whom I know and who is engaged in the manufacture of chains.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Houston). The Clerk will read the letter.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk is about to read a communication for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in his time.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHICAGO, March 18, 1913.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Now that President Wilson has issued the call for a special session of Congress to consider a new tariff bill, we wish to call your attention to the item of chain in the iron and steel schedule.

The present duty on chain is 45 per cent ad valorem, and I understand that Mr. UNDERWOOD proposes to cut this to about 20 per cent. This is entirely too much of a reduction, for the simple reason that it will allow chain which is made in foreign countries to come in in such quantities as to close down the shops in this country unless the wages of our men are almost cut in half.

This is a pretty strong statement, but when you consider that in Germany boys of from 12 to 16 years of age are employed in making the lighter sizes of chain and are paid 35 cents a day; from 16 to 18, 45 cents per day; 18 to 20, 60 cents per day; and married men, 87½ cents per day.

In England, in the "black district," women and girls make all the smaller sizes of chain, and it is one of the worst "sweated" trades there is. These women are known as "outworkers" and earn from \$1.50 to \$3.50 per week.

The making of chain is on a piecework scale of wages, and on one size the men are paid 40 cents per 100 pounds, where we in this country pay 84 cents, other sizes in proportion.

A very timely article on this subject appeared in the January 3, 1913, edition of the Hardware Reporter, and it fully describes the condition in "the black country."

A reduction in the tariff, as proposed by Mr. UNDERWOOD, will come very nearly destroying the chain-making industry in this country, and we trust you will do everything in your power to have a duty sufficiently high retained to enable us to continue in business and pay reasonable wages to our men.

After a careful study of the situation, we firmly believe that any duty lower than what would be the equivalent of 35 per cent ad valorem would be disastrous to the industry.

Will you kindly let us hear from you in regard to the above?

Yours, very truly,

S. G. TAYLOR CHAIN CO.

S. G. TAYLOR, Jr., President.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert as a new paragraph the following:

"PAR. 128½. All scientific and surgical instruments and equipment, 5 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that is not in order at this point in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, what is the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. That it is not germane to this paragraph of the bill.

Mr. MANN. It is a new paragraph. It was not offered as germane to any paragraph. It is germane to the bill and germane to this schedule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman overlooks the proposition that it must be germane to the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon, but he offered it as an independent paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood the gentleman to offer it as an amendment to this paragraph.

Mr. MANN. No. He offered it as an independent paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order. I think that is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS] is recognized.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to state this to the majority leader, as I do not believe he was in the room a while ago. I received a letter this morning from Dr. J. B. Mason, of London, Ky., who is a dentist, and in his letter he wants to know what data, if any, your bill carries on scientific and surgical instruments and equipment. He goes on further to state that it is his information that practically none of these are manufactured in this country. He states further that it costs an American doctor at least 100 per cent more to equip his office than it does a German doctor. Now, if that is true, I think this paragraph ought to be voted into this bill. I would like to hear the majority leader on the matter.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the gentleman proposes to put a tax of 5 per cent on surgical in-

struments. Now, most surgical instruments in this bill are taxed under the basket clause 25 per cent. Some of them are in 136, "Hospital utensils," that are also taxed at 25 per cent. But the bill carries in the bill philosophical and scientific apparatus, utensils, instruments, and so on, imported specially by order for the use of any society or institution incorporated or established for religious, philosophical, educational, scientific, or literary purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or for the use and by order of any college, academy, school, or seminary of learning in the United States, and so on.

Now, I think that that is a very broad exception to the rule. These surgical instruments, under the bill as it stands, for a hospital, or for an eleemosynary institution, can be brought in free. But even that liberality was protested against. The testimony had before the Committee on Ways and Means showed that some of the surgical instruments are patented, and that many are devised by American doctors without patents. As a rule, they do not take out a patent on them, but get a manufacturer in America to make them, and after they are made and introduced and used here they are copied abroad and shipped in here.

I think this provision exempting them from taxation when intended for use in hospitals or in eleemosynary institutions and in works of science is as broad as it is necessary to go. They are on a revenue basis, and I do not think there is any reason for adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. If I understand the gentleman's explanation, that provision applies to hospitals and eleemosynary institutions?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. But it does not apply to the individual dentists, and those individual dentists' tools would come in under the basket clause, which carries a duty of 25 per cent?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; and that is a reduction from 45 per cent to 25 per cent.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama yield to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. On page 120, in the free list, these instruments and tools of trade are exempted to those persons who emigrate to the United States—professional persons. Does not the gentleman think that if those persons can bring their instruments here with them our own professional people ought to have an equal opportunity of obtaining them?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I think the gentleman's question is rather captious. When an immigrant comes to our shores and wants to bring with him the tools of his trade we let him bring them, as we let him bring the clothes on his body, free. We do not want him to wander around the streets without clothes, or be taxed for the clothes on his back, and we allow him to bring in also the tools of his trade in his hand, so as to enable him to earn an honest living in America. The conditions are entirely different.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the debate be closed on this paragraph and amendments thereto.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is quoting an old Republican doctrine that has been heard here for a good many years. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. POWERS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

130. Penknives, pocketknives, clasp knives, pruning knives, budding knives, erasers, manicure knives, and all knives by whatever name known, including such as are denominatively mentioned in this section, which have folding or other than fixed blades or attachments, and razors, all the foregoing, whether assembled but not fully finished or finished; valued at not more than \$1 per dozen, 35 per cent ad valorem; valued at more than \$1 per dozen, 55 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That blades, handles, or other parts of any of the foregoing knives, razors, or erasers shall be dutiable at not less than the rate herein imposed upon the knives, razors, and erasers of which they are parts. Scissors and shears, and blades for the same, finished or unfinished, 30 per cent ad valorem: *Provided further*, That all articles specified in this paragraph shall, when imported, have the name of the maker or purchaser and beneath the same the name of the country of origin die-sunk conspicuously and indelibly on the blade, shank, or tang of at least one or, if practicable, each and every blade thereof.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the paragraphs where the gentlemen on the other side have had a change of heart since the Underwood bill of a year ago was prepared. That bill put a duty of 35 per cent on all of these articles. This bill, after exempting a considerable class of articles which sell for less than a dollar a dozen, leaving those in that class at 35 per cent, increases the remainder from 35 per cent to 55 per cent.

I am inclined to think that if the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means had about 10 years longer they would be able to get up a pretty good bill, because occasionally when they make a move they move in the right direction. They have improved the Underwood bill of a year ago very much on this paragraph.

Now this paragraph puts the same duty on the parts as it does on the assembled knives. This thing of bringing in knives in parts is something that occurred away back in 1890, when they evaded the proper tariff on cutlery by bringing it in in parts at a lower rate of duty—just what they would do if there is any opportunity to do it in the case of automobiles. I do not care so much about automobiles. Four years ago we found that they were not building any automobiles in this country and we placed a lower rate on a great many things that came in in the basket clause at 45 per cent and left automobiles at 45 per cent. The result has been in the last four years something that is marvelous, or would be if it had not happened so frequently in this country before, to the same or to a greater degree, by the multiplying of the products of the factories since putting on a protective tariff. Why, it was almost a new industry four years ago, and you have heard a description of the wonderful growth of it in the city of Detroit and in Michigan and all over the country. In my own town there are three factories that are making automobile parts, and they are busy all the time and inventing new parts. Our inventive genius has been at work, and it will always be at work whenever we have an industry here protected so that the boys and the men can be brought face to face with the problem to see what they have got to do toward inventing machines that cheapen the cost of production and add to the value of the labor that is put in by the human hand. We have developed this wonderful industry in automobiles in the last four years. The gentlemen have kept the duty on. Of course it was not at all for the sake of protection. They did not do it because they did not want to run the risk of throttling this industry, but they have kept on the duty of 45 per cent.

I think probably they could safely have reduced it, because the industry has become established, and because we are doing the best work, and we are selling our cheap machines abroad. And notwithstanding the slander that has gone out from high quarters against our American manufacturers and against the laborers at work in our shops and the skill of our mechanics, four years have demonstrated that we can learn more about making automobiles, and have learned more, than any other country in the world. Now, that does not mean that we can get along unless we can keep this market for our people, even at competitive rates. We must have the difference if we pay the difference in wages to labor. We have got to have this, the best market in the world, to keep our factories running, and when they do run, to sell something across the water and increase the output, and run them day in and day out, day and night. And having paid the original overhead charges, we can cheapen the article here and cheapen it elsewhere, and so go on from prosperity to prosperity. Do not turn them out and tell them that we will not give them an adequate tariff to make up the difference in cost here and abroad because of our labor, but give them the continued opportunity. I shall have something to say again, by and by, when we reach it, on these articles that we snatched out of the "not otherwise provided" clause in the tariff, where they had been running for years, four years ago, and put them in other places in the bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman criticizes this clause in the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. I am commending it, as far as it goes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. But the gentleman criticized our putting the same rate on blades and handles and other parts of knives and cutlery that we placed on the knives themselves.

Mr. PAYNE. I was commending it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I understood the gentleman to criticize it.

Mr. PAYNE. Oh, no; you did exactly right, as far as you went.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on pocketknives and clasp knives valued at not exceeding \$1.25 a dozen the rate in his bill was 5 cents per piece and 40 per cent ad valorem. On parts of knives and

blades valued at not exceeding \$1.25 per dozen the rate was 5 cents per piece and 40 per cent ad valorem. On knives valued above \$1.25 and not exceeding \$3 your rate was 10 cents apiece and 40 per cent ad valorem. On parts valued at more than \$1.25 but not exceeding \$3 your rate on the parts was 10 cents apiece and 40 per cent ad valorem. On knives valued above \$3 per dozen your rate was 20 cents apiece and 40 per cent ad valorem. On the parts valued above \$3 per dozen your rate was 20 cents apiece and 40 per cent ad valorem, putting exactly the same rate on the parts as you put on the knives themselves. Yet you criticize our bill for doing the same thing.

Now, we did change this rate. Gentlemen on that side of the House are disposed to criticize this committee because we are not standpatters. Well, I recognize that we are not standpatters. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] is an old member of that school in every sense of the word; but this committee was glad to receive information, glad to adjust its rates according to its principles. With the lights before us a year ago, we fixed a rate of 35 per cent on this entire schedule. After further investigation we found that the 35 per cent was an ample rate, in our judgment, on cutlery valued at less than \$1 a dozen, but that we were going to have a very competitive rate on cutlery valued above a dollar a dozen. Now, our principle is to levy a revenue tax, and by that we mean a competitive tax, and by a competitive tax we mean a tax that produces reasonable competition and not disastrous competition.

As we thought that the rate we had a year ago probably was too drastic and allowed competition to be too great, and unnecessarily too great, and by a division of rates we could still have a reasonable competitive tariff—one that would bring sufficient revenue to the Government on a competitive rate—both rates were largely decreased in the present bill. We concluded that it was wise for us to divide this paragraph in two parts and put a higher rate on those valued at a dollar a dozen in order that we might carry out our principles within reasonable limits.

Now, the gentleman from New York criticizes the fact that we made changes in this bill. Why, gentlemen, if you would view the Payne bill as it came before this House four years ago, I believe after it was reported to the House, not originally introduced—there were two prints in the House, and when it came back from the Senate its own author did not know it. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

On many of the vital items in the bill the gentleman from New York took this bill back into the committee and changed it continuously.

Mr. PAYNE. I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that this bill has not got back from the Senate yet. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not a prophet, but I think the bill will come back more recognizable than did the gentleman's bill. Mr. Chairman, I ask that debate on the paragraph close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Houston). The gentleman from Alabama moves that debate close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, lines 9 and 10, after the word "dozen" in each line, strike out the figures 35 and 55, and insert in lieu thereof the figures 45 and 65.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Alabama whether he does not think the present rates are really entitled to be called competitive? According to the statistics I have, the American production of pocketknives amounted to about \$3,000,000, with importations amounting to about two million and a half dollars. That comes pretty near making competitive rates. The rates in this paragraph have been cut below the rates in the Wilson bill of 1896, which were 53.12, and these rates are 40. It seems to me that they ought to be put back to what they were in the Wilson bill or a little above.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that there are some parts of this schedule that are quite competitive. There are other parts that are entirely prohibitive. The lower grade of knives under the present rates is prohibitive. The competitive part of this schedule is largely above the dollar a dozen. We have cut most of the things that go into the cost of production in these knives. Take the whole schedule and there was only \$811,000 in importations. Now, we have not made a drastic cut in these rates under these circumstances, because we have left on this class of knives above a dollar a dozen 55 per cent, one of the highest rates in this bill. When you come to consider that 55 per cent will largely more than equalize the difference in cost of labor—as a matter of fact the 55 per cent will more than amount to the entire labor

cost—it seems to me that we have left a very reasonable rate in this bill so far as the manufacturer is concerned, and yet a rate that, I think, will produce a fair amount of competition, and we intended to produce a fair amount of competition.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am occupying the time of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from New York has yielded the floor. A moment ago, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], the gentleman from Alabama said that the Committee on Ways and Means had changed the rates in the pending Underwood bill from those in the Underwood bill of a year ago, because on further investigation the committee had found that the bill of a year ago would permit too great competition. Too great competition for whom—the consumer?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; it could not be too great for the consumer.

Mr. COOPER. Then, if it is not too great for the consumer, is the gentleman trying to protect the producer—the manufacturer—against competition?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. We were compelled to lower the tariff to a revenue basis, and a revenue basis does not mean that there shall be great competition with the American producer, that he shall be overwhelmed with competition.

It means reasonable competition, and, as I stated, we were apprehensive that the rate established two years ago on the top end of this schedule might produce too great competition with the American manufacturer, and therefore, in justice to the American manufacturer we put the rate higher than we had it in last year's bill, but make a considerable reduction below what it was in the Payne bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, too great competition means too much importation, but great importation would produce revenue. Does the gentleman mean too much revenue?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course, the gentleman is trying to assume that it is necessary for us to throw down the bars and consider nothing in this reduction but the question of the floodgate of importation and increasing the revenue.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption right there?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Wait one moment until I finish. I have said in the beginning, and I say now, that although on that side of the House you criticize this bill as a drastic bill and as a drastic revision, that except in some vital necessities the committee has endeavored to lower this tariff with a jackscrew and not with an axe, and in cutting this rate we preferred to make it more gradual than we had it in the other bill. That is the whole thing.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, what I had in mind was this: The Democratic platform declares that a tariff levied to protect an American industry is in violation of the Constitution of the United States. If this be true, it follows, therefore, that Members of Congress having sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, and to support it without mental reservation, have taken an oath not to enact a tariff to protect an industry against too great competition. The Democratic tariff must be for revenue only, and the question of the welfare or the condition of an industry or the question of too great competition ought not to be taken into account.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. MANN. But, Mr. Chairman, I understood that certain gentlemen were to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota was to be recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. I thought I was to be recognized for five minutes, and if the Chair will recognize me now I will be very glad to yield one minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

The CHAIRMAN. Very well.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] said that under his bill of a year ago there was danger of too great competition, but not, he said, too great competition for the consumer—there could not be for the consumer. Then he must have meant for the American producer—that is, the American producer and manufacturer were to meet with too great competition—and to remedy this the rates were changed in the Underwood bill now before us. And yet, according to the Democratic platform adopted last year, rates fixed in a tariff bill in order to shield a manufacturer from

too great competition violate the Constitution of the United States.

I cite this only to show in this instance the utter inconsistency between Democratic platform principles and Democratic practice.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, when the bill passed last year it carried a 35 per cent ad valorem rate upon knives valued either above or below \$1 per dozen. In the veto message which President Taft sent to this House he called attention to the fact that this rate on knives would destroy the industry of producing the higher priced knives in this country. The gentlemen thereupon made a further study of the subject, and now propose a rate of 35 per cent on knives below \$1 a dozen and 55 per cent on knives above \$1 a dozen. Of course, with the rate at 35 per cent the amount paid would be very much higher on knives above a dollar a dozen than on knives below a dollar a dozen; but here is a jump in the rate from 35 per cent to 55 per cent, as a protective measure, and to that extent I commend the gentlemen for following the advice of President Taft on the subject.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] a moment ago undertook to say, as I understood him, that under the Payne law the rates on parts of knives is the same as the rate on the finished knives. I do not so understand. I do not know what the gentleman was reading from, but probably one of the Treasury reports.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Here it is in my hand—imports for consumption.

Mr. MANN. Very well, and I hold the law in my hand.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Here is the Treasury authority upon the subject.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; that is not Treasury authority at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It gives the rates.

Mr. MANN. That is, giving the amount of importations.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no; it gives the rates. If the gentleman wants to see it, I will be glad to show it to him.

Mr. MANN. I will take what the gentleman said there, although that is not complete. There the rate given was 10 cents each, plus an ad valorem rate, whether it was a knife or an unfinished part of a knife. Does anyone say that is the same rate? If you have 10 cents apiece on the blade and 10 cents apiece on the knife that is not the same as 10 cents on the finished knife. I am going to say I know the gentleman from Alabama is able to add 10 and 10 together and make 20. The rate is not the same and was not the same, and the information which the gentleman has is not complete. This is the law which I am holding in my hand in comparison with the existing law. The Payne law was designed to have knives made and assembled here in this country by American labor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] repudiates with considerable heat and some scorn the idea that he is a protectionist. If I have said anything from which it may be fairly inferred that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was a real protectionist, I did him a great injustice. He is not a real protectionist. He is only a semiprotectionist. He believes in partly protecting the industries of the great State of Pennsylvania. He does not believe in protecting the wool industry of the State of Wyoming or the wheat industry of the State of Minnesota, so I say that he is only a semiprotectionist. Now, the gentleman from Alabama insists that the rates of the present bill are competitive. I pointed out several instances in which the rates of the present bill are very large increases over the rates of the Underwood bill of the last Congress. We were told during the last Congress that the rates of that bill were competitive. Now, I submit that if the rates of that bill were competitive the rates which have been increased in this bill are prohibitive. Again, if the rates of this bill are competitive, the rates of that bill were way below the competitive rate and destructive, and the only fair inference is that that bill was offered and passed through the House and the Senate with a view of its meeting the presidential veto and of fooling the American people.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, we have heard much in reference to the proposed new competitive tariff. If there is any place that it has application, here is the schedule to which it ought to be applied. The importations of this class of goods are now large, and they are constantly increasing. The rates which are imposed by this bill under consideration, with one exception, are not as much as they were under the Wilson bill, under which the industry was gradually dying out. The wages paid in this industry here in America are three times what they are in Germany, from which nearly all the importations come. The gentleman says he has imposed a rate in this bill which will cover the difference in cost. If so, why were these importations being continually increased, and what figures

have been given to show when the wages are so much larger in this country than they are abroad? This rate that is proposed is not nearly enough to cover the difference in wages and the other increased costs of manufacturing in this country. It is simply leaving the American worker on cutlery at the mercy of his foreign competitors.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

137. Needles for knitting or sewing machines, latch needles, crochet needles, and tape needles, knitting and all curriers', drawing, farriers', fleshing, hay, tanners', plumbers', painters', palette, artists', and shoe knives, forks and steels, finished or unfinished, without handles, 25 per cent ad valorem; with handles, 30 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That all the articles specified in this paragraph, when imported, shall have the name of the maker or purchaser, and beneath the same the name of the country of origin indelibly stamped or branded thereon in a place that shall not be covered thereafter.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I tried to get recognition from the Chair on the last paragraph in regard to butcher knives, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not hear the gentleman and will recognize the gentleman now.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I simply want to call attention to the fact that there is a raise on the butcher and kitchen knife business in the duty. The paragraph in the former Underwood bill had a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem in those knives with or without handles, but they differentiate here; without handles they put it at 25 per cent and with handles they put it at 30 per cent, another instance where he ought to take off his hat to President Taft and beg his pardon for what he had said about him in the campaign when he called attention in his veto to these various little slips that he had made in that bill, having so many things not even on a competitive basis let alone a protective basis. There is another thing to which I wish to call attention. The President of the United States in his campaign last fall said that his cheek blushed with shame when he saw in a shop an article stamped, "Made in Germany." He did not know that was in the law. They have got it in this bill, they had it in the former paragraph requiring the stamping of the name on the article itself, and I hope the gentleman, when he consults with the President the next time about this bill, will tell the President that that was put in the law way back in 1890 and it has been kept there ever since.

That is the reason his cheeks flushed with shame when he saw "Made in Germany" on the knife, and arrived at the unpatriotic conclusion that that was because the Germany goods were better. It was because our American goods are better that our American manufacturers insisted that that stamp be put on the article, way back in 1890, and because of their insistence it is there yet in this present law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman states that this paragraph is a raise in the rates. The Payne bill levied a rate of 41 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. I did not say it raised the rate in the Payne bill, but in the Underwood bill of a year ago.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman failed to explain himself, and therefore I will apologize.

Mr. PAYNE. I spoke about the President's vetoing of your bill a year ago. The gentleman does not pay attention.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will leave it to the Record. You would imagine from what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] said a moment ago that the President had vetoed these iron and steel schedules on account of these items we had raised. I have just read the veto message to see whether he said anything about knives, or butcher knives, or the raising of the rates; and if the President ever heard of the subject he entirely overlooked it and did not mention it in his message.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will allow me, I could tell the gentleman they were not mentioned by name in the veto message, and also that the President got his information before the Senate committee, both as to knives and other items, and that is the reason he vetoed your bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He vetoed it without informing us, and, therefore, as he did not inform us it is evident that we did not raise the rate on account of the President's vetoing it.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman has the message there. Did he not say he vetoed it because you had reduced the rates on certain articles there?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; the principal tune the President sung in this message was in relation to machine tools made in Cincinnati.

Mr. PAYNE. He spoke generally about rates.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The President probably told the gentleman from New York his reasons for vetoing the bill under the

impression that he was the Congress, and then forgot to put it in his message.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Exactly. And cutlery is a very important industry in the State of my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE], and as the President left it out of the veto message I have no doubt he saved the soul of the gentleman from New York by telling him he was taking care of his home industry.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to say to the gentleman that I never said a word concerning the veto message to the President.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in view of the recent statement of an explanation of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] as to the competitive principle in this tariff, I would like to ask the gentleman whether on the paragraph we passed a short time ago, as to automobiles, the 45 per cent is a competitive or a revenue-raising rate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I positively decline to go back to it at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I hope we will have time to do so in the consideration of this bill, so that we may have an explanation as to whether the rate in the automobile item is a competitive or a revenue-raising rate.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that during his absence I fully discussed that, as did my colleague, and I refer him to to-morrow morning's Record for the information.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 12, after the word "shotguns," strike out the comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

135. Breech-loading shotguns and rifles, combination shotguns and rifles, and parts thereof and fittings therefor, including barrels further advanced than rough bored only; pistols, whether automatic, magazine, or revolving, or parts thereof and fittings therefor, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] a moment ago were unreasonable enough to expect the gentlemen in charge of the bill to express or to exhibit any consistent line of argument with regard to it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to advise my friend from Wyoming that I am going to be unreasonable enough to insist that he shall argue this paragraph. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Very well. I shall be very glad to do it, because this paragraph illustrates the inconsistency to which I was going to refer. Sometimes the gentlemen place a higher rate of duty on the raw material or on the parts of the finished product than on the finished product itself. Sometimes the rates are just the other way, and sometimes, as in this case, the rate is the same on the raw material, on the parts, and on the finished product.

I was about to remark, when interrupted by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], that it is altogether unreasonable for gentlemen on this side to expect the gentlemen in charge of the bill to be logical in their explanation of the bill, because the bill itself is so illogical that there is no logical explanation that can be given of its paragraphs and of its rates. We started out with a free-trade schedule and with a free-trade defender thereof in the person of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HARRISON]. The next schedule was defended by a tariff-for-revenue gentleman, with some leaning toward protection. This particular schedule is in the charge of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who is a partial protectionist in spots. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Wyoming is not discussing kitchen knives or table knives, although his discussion is very pointed [laughter], or any sort of a gun.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the cases where I understand the gentleman has reduced the rate with a jackscrew. [Laughter on the Republican side.] How much the gentleman must have regretted it when some one who is said to reside at the other end of the Avenue took the jackscrew from under his wool rate! [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I will not say that placing wool on the free list is a reduction with an ax, it is a reduction by dynamite, even more destructive than by any ax. [Laughter.] In this particular paragraph the gentleman is consistent in his inconsistency, and the American manufacturer can either buy the parts of his shotguns

abroad or buy them at home, as he sees fit. Ordinarily in the interest of competition the gentleman from Alabama has so arranged the rates that it is to the advantage of the manufacturer or of the assembler of manufactured articles to buy the parts abroad and employ no labor in the United States in the fabrication of these articles, save alone in their assembling. But the gentleman is not consistent as to that, because that rule, carried out in some of the schedules, is violated in others, as it is in the one now under discussion. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

136. Table, kitchen, and hospital utensils, or other similar hollow ware of aluminum or of iron or steel, enameled or glazed with vitreous glasses, but not ornamented or decorated with lithographic or other printing, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 20, after the word "ware," insert the words "composed wholly or of chief value."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

140. Rivets, studs, and steel points, lathed, machined, or brightened, and rivets or studs for nonskidding automobile tires, and rivets of iron or steel, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

141. Crosscut saws, mill saws, pit and drag saws, circular saws, steel band saws, finished or further advanced than tempered and polished, hand, back, and all other saws, not specially provided for in this section, 12 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask my friend from Pennsylvania if these saws embraced in this paragraph at 12 per cent duty include the Disston saws that he found advertised in the Saturday Evening Post that were sold all over creation and everywhere else?

Mr. PALMER. Yes; and we reduced the rate from something like—

Mr. PAYNE. I can tell the gentleman—from 25 per cent to 12 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. I think it was from 30 per cent to 12 per cent.

Mr. PAYNE. No; from 25 per cent to 12 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. Below the Payne law.

Mr. PAYNE. I think I cut it in two four years ago.

Mr. PALMER. And we followed suit and cut it in two again.

Mr. PAYNE. You are following suit on a good many things and are learning all the time. If you would only be consistent about it we could commend your bill.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I should like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania why it is that he reduced down to 20 per cent ad valorem the duty on rivets or studs for nonskidding automobile tires but retained the duty of 45 per cent on the automobiles?

Mr. PALMER. If the gentleman had been here when we discussed the automobile question—

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Unfortunately I was not, and unfortunately also I have not the disposition to read all that the gentleman said about it. It would take too much time.

Mr. PALMER. I do not think the gentleman ought to take advantage of his absence from his duty to compel us to go over again that which we have discussed very considerably in his absence.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. And I think it is very unfair to ask the rest of us to listen to it, too. [Laughter.]

Mr. PALMER. I think so. I agree with that entirely. But I will say to the gentleman from South Dakota briefly that it is only finished automobiles that bear the rate of 45 per cent. The automobile chassis, which is the only part of the automobile which is imported for the cheaper cars or for the commercial cars, comes in at 30 per cent, and parts of automobiles under this law come in at 20 per cent.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Why should these separate parts pay 20 per cent and the parts combined into an automobile pay 45 per cent?

Mr. PALMER. In the interest of finishing this bill I refer the gentleman to the Record. I do not care to go over that any more.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

143. Umbrella and parasol ribs and stretchers, composed in chief value of iron, steel, or other metal, in frames or otherwise, and tubes for umbrellas, wholly or partially finished, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 13, after the word "finished," strike out "35 per cent ad valorem" and insert "40 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph illustrates the habit of the committee of imposing even higher duties on the raw materials than on the finished articles. It is strange that so many people of the United States were deceived during the late campaign into believing that the Democratic Party would play fair with the manufacturers of the country, and would not destroy legitimate industries.

One of the gentlemen who had perfect faith that the party now in control would frame a tariff bill that would not destroy legitimate industry advises me that "a mistake" has been made in that part of the bill which relates to umbrellas and the component parts thereof. Indeed, I find there are several gentlemen who have the same notion. One of them writes:

Now, it must surely have been an oversight on the part of the committee to give a preference of 15 per cent to foreign manufacturers and to otherwise handicap the American makers by having the completed article 15 per cent lower than the component parts. Such a schedule, if put through, would be apt to put every American manufacturer out of business.

Mr. Chairman, the committee in this bill fixed the umbrella duty at 30 per cent ad valorem, and then they fixed the duty upon umbrella and parasol ribs and stretchers which enter into the manufacture of the umbrella at 35 per cent. Then, in order to make it still more interesting to the man whose industry in this country was not to be destroyed, when it came to the woven fabric, of which silk was a component part, they provided a duty of 45 per cent ad valorem, so that they made it utterly impossible, if a man wanted to manufacture an umbrella in this country, to get any of his raw materials at a less price than the foreigner could send his finished umbrella into the country for.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman will allow me, I want to suggest to him that the item was in at 30 per cent instead of 35 per cent in the Underwood bill a year ago, and undoubtedly the veto was what called attention to it. I want to inquire whether it would not have been better for these gentlemen to have gone to the White House a year ago, instead of confining their visit to about a month ago?

Mr. MOORE. I think the gentleman is entirely right in his supposition as to what they should have done. But the truth is, the committee saw that an error had been made in attempting to establish a revenue duty in regard to umbrella frames, and did, on the appeal of certain Democratic representatives of manufacturers of umbrellas, change base and give an added protection of 5 per cent, bringing the rate upon finished umbrellas up to 35 per cent. As the situation now stands, umbrella and parasol ribs and stretchers, composed in chief value of iron, steel, or other metals, and tubes for umbrellas are to come into the United States at a duty of 35 per cent, and the finished umbrella is to come in at 35 per cent, but the silk which goes into the umbrella—and most people, whether rich or poor, use umbrellas in this country—is taxed at 45 per cent. So everything as it stands in the bill is in the interest of the men who want to send abroad to manufacture umbrellas and the component parts, because it is impossible for men in the United States to get their raw materials cheaper than the finished product.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the discussion with which we have been favored ought to commend itself to the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming—

Mr. MONDELL. It does. [Laughter.]

Mr. PALMER (continuing). As evidence of that inconsistency in the conduct of men when it comes to making tariffs that seems to arouse his criticism. He would do well if he would train his popguns upon his colleagues on that side of the aisle who have just now exhibited this startling inconsistency.

We find the gentleman from New York cooperating with the gentleman from Minnesota at all times, and complaining against our conduct in raising the rates in the bill over those of the Underwood bill of a year ago. We find immediately afterwards the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], and the gentleman from Iowa, to whom evidently an absolutely contrary duty has been assigned in this debate, complaining because we did not raise the rates high enough.

The gentleman from New York takes us to task for raising the rates from 30 per cent to 35 per cent over the Underwood

bill, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania takes us to task for not raising the rates from 30 per cent to 40 per cent.

Now, as to the gentleman's charge of inconsistency by reason of carrying a larger rate on the materials or parts than we do on the finished product. I could call his attention to dozens of cases in every tariff law which has ever been on the statute books where that necessarily inconsistent feature appears. It is far less inconsistent in a Democratic bill written upon a Democratic theory than it would be or has been in some of the Republican bills in the past, because when we write a rate with regard to the competition which will result from the rate we do not necessarily take into consideration the rates upon the component materials that go into the finished product, but the exact situation in trade between this country and other countries.

There may be now less competition in the finished article than in the component parts, or vice versa, and it is a question of how much competition now prevails under the present rate. That is largely instrumental in determining whether the rates should be reduced, and how far, in order that a proper amount of competition throughout the entire line of business activity in these manufactured articles may be kept up; we consider the amount of the production in this country in connection with the amount of imports under the rate, and fix the rate with regard to that. If it so happens that the component materials carry a higher rate than the finished article, it will be because there is to-day less competition in the finished article than in the component material, and we desire to bring about a proper relation.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman think that is a fair argument to apply to a man whose house is burning?

Mr. PALMER. Nobody's house is burning as far as umbrella ribs are concerned. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think this afternoon of the second day of proceeding under these various schedules has got far enough along to sample the quality of this bill and to demonstrate conclusively that it is not built upon any consistent plan or system that the gentleman from Pennsylvania or anyone else can explain to the satisfaction of reasonable men.

If they have made a reduction in the rates and it will bring in a greater revenue because of greater importations, the explanation is that this is a revenue tariff, and they have no regard for its effect upon the industries of the country; and if, on the other hand, they have so changed the rates that importations will be reduced, they state that we are not compelled to seek a revenue from this particular item because we now have an income tax. Here is an instance in the umbrella schedule upon which they have the rates on the raw material higher than the finished product. We have just had another schedule, to wit, the automobile schedule, in which they have the finished-product rates much higher than the rates on the various parts composing it.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman will notice that if the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] shall prevail, the rate on the raw or semiraw materials will be still higher than the rate on the finished product.

Mr. MOORE. We will come to that when we reach it.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am not so much interested in the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] as I am in the efforts—futile efforts, it seems to me—of the gentlemen to explain the system of construction upon which the bill has been made. It makes no difference what you call the rate on any article; it is to the extent of the rate protective. Take the automobile industry—a consumption of automobiles in this country to the amount of \$158,000,000. There is a rate of 45 per cent. That is prohibitive, practically. Less than \$2,000,000 in value of automobiles were brought into this country, and only about \$2,000,000 in parts and completed automobiles altogether.

Take the completed automobiles and the component parts and the consumption in this country is over \$240,000,000. The rate of 45 per cent is practically prohibitive. It is a protective rate, no matter what you call it. It does not produce revenue; it does not produce foreign competition in the industry. The Republican Party are frank enough to say that this rate is made because the industry is employing thousands and thousands of American laborers and consuming thousands upon thousands of American raw materials as well as foreign raw materials; building up a great profitable industry that has probably added more impetus than any other one single industry to the prosperity of this country in the last 10 years. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] is not willing to destroy this industry nor to place it upon either a revenue basis or a competitive

basis, and he is not frank enough to say that he has regard for this important industry. The fact of the business is that the rates protect. If you can produce an article in this country and you put a rate upon it, you protect it, no matter what you may call it, and the merits of this bill, when it is in operation, will be judged by whether it tends to encourage or destroy the great prosperity in which we are now indulging.

Last year, 1912, marked the high-water mark both in production and exportation. We produced in round figures something like \$30,000,000,000, \$8,500,000,000 in agriculture and \$21,000,000,000 of manufactures. We exported \$2,204,000,000 of that. We imported something like \$1,600,000,000. They were the largest exportations and importations in the history of the country. We can stand experimentation now, perhaps, as well as at any other time, and when these gentlemen have placed their tariff schedules in operation, they will be judged according to how they work. A protective principle always has worked well and always will work well in this country, and I commend their preserving some measure of protection on some of the important industries, although I can not commend their lack of frankness in confessing the fact.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, speaking of the umbrella paragraph, in order that I may be within the rules, I am glad that there is one proposition on which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] and I are in full agreement. He says that the bumps and inconsistencies in this bill are not so remarkable in a Democratic bill as they would be in a Republican bill. I agree with him on that proposition absolutely. As a matter of fact, I have about come to the conclusion that the gentlemen do not expect to be expected to be consistent. It is unfortunate the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not give sufficient attention to what was said by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] and his colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] to understand that they did not protest against his having increased or decreased any one particular rate. What they did protest against was the bumpy, humpy, hobble-skirted, limping character of these schedules. For instance, here are certain of the component parts of umbrellas at 35 per cent. Over on page 97 are other parts of umbrellas at 30 per cent, and in the silk schedule are other parts of umbrellas at 45 per cent, and the umbrella itself bears a rate of 35 per cent. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania knows—we all know—that there is neither rhyme nor reason in that sort of thing. It is just common, ordinary blundering, as, in my opinion, the rates on automobiles and their parts are. When the gentleman from South Dakota asked why these inconsistencies in the automobile schedule, he is told to read in the RECORD to-morrow the explanation the gentlemen from Alabama and Pennsylvania claim to have made.

The trouble is that when the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from South Dakota examine the RECORD to-morrow they will discover that the gentlemen from Alabama and Pennsylvania sent them to the RECORD for a snipe hunt. They will find no explanation there. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] well said, there is no one on earth outside of a certain class of eleemosynary institutions or the victims of an overdose of Welsh rarebit who can explain why automobiles should be 40 per cent, parts of automobiles 20 per cent; bicycles, 25 per cent, parts and all; and these little choo-choo affairs that are a cross between the bicycle and the automobile bear a different rate from either of the other two, both in whole and in part. There is no explanation for these things, no logic in them.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I care to take up the full five minutes. The discussion of this bill, as the discussion of all tariff questions, brings out argument in favor of designing measures that will protect laborers, and some gentleman has this afternoon stated that organized labor was for a protective tariff. Even in this debate since this bill has been before the committee reference has been made to a comparison between some of the building trades in this country and those of some foreign countries, when in fact the tariff can not have anything to do with the wages of the building craftsmen of this country. They do not build buildings in foreign countries and sell them in competition with the builders here, and the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the American building craftsmen are not only the best paid workmen of this country or any other country, but they are the most efficient and capable workmen. We construct buildings cheaper in the United States than anywhere else. I do not blame the gentle-

man for taking these things as a joke, because he does not care anything about the working people anyhow, probably. The fact is you are not going to fool the working people any more with this argument that you are making about protecting the American workingman. He has waked up to the fact that you have been fooling him for all these years and he is not going to allow the wool to be pulled over his eyes any longer.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. This is umbrellas.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. That is one of the hopeful signs, that they have woken up to the deception that has been practiced on them in these arguments by men who should be representing them here in a sincere and honest manner.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I just want to call the attention of the gentleman from Alabama to the fact that the gentleman from Illinois is not strictly observing the rule that he enforced against me this morning.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman is talking about honest men now.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have no objection and I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. If I have made any objectionable remarks, I might withdraw them, but I am getting tired of this argument about protecting labor when labor has always had to fight its own battles, and probably will have to in the future. What labor wants is to have their legal and constitutional rights protected and a fair opportunity and a square deal; they do not need any tariff laws to protect them at all. I want to have read here as a part of my remarks, in my own time, a statement made before President Taft by the secretary of the Federation of Labor urging the signing of the immigration bill. I desire to have part of that read to show the position he takes; that a protective tariff, while it protects the manufacturer in collecting tribute in the way of abnormally high prices from the working people of this country, never has given the workingman any protection in the way of high wages.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. President, it is now an undisputed fact that in many industries the emigrants who come here are working for such low wages that the American born can not compete with them. They can not live on the wages paid and support a family.

In support of the position that the American born can not compete with foreigners and live on the wages paid to them and support a family, I refer you to the investigation of the Bethlehem Steel Works made by a committee of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ and the investigation made by Commissioner Neill, of the Department of Labor, as to wages and conditions in the steel industry.

We ask for this legislation for the purpose of giving the wage workers of this country an opportunity for self-improvement; an opportunity for a breathing spell, so they can secure improved conditions both as to hours and wages.

In passing I will call your attention to the fact that industry is protected by a tariff, but labor is not. The products of labor are protected, but we have a free flow of labor coming to these shores all the time. The manufacturers have protection against products manufactured by cheap labor in foreign countries, but labor has no protection against the importation of cheap labor.

The opponents of this measure will say that if the products of labor are protected, then labor itself must be benefited, because the manufacturer can sell the product at a much higher rate than can be obtained in other countries, and will thus be in a position to pay higher wages to his employees. The first contention is well founded. The manufacturer does receive a higher rate than the products can be purchased in other countries, and the second contention, that they can pay higher wages to their employees, is also true, but the fact is they do not pay higher wages. They pay lower wages. We find that in the highest protected industries, particularly in the industries that are now controlled by trusts, such as the Steel Trust, Rubber Trust, Sugar Trust, packing-house employees, and textile industry, the lowest wage in the country is paid to their employees, and in some of them less than a living wage for a family. A high tariff has nothing to do with the wages paid in these industries.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MOORE. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 23, yeas 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

144. Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, made of iron or steel, and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotive, car, or other railway tires or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 25 per cent ad valorem; ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, or blanks for the same, without regard to the degree of manufacture, 10 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That when wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, of iron or steel, are imported with iron or steel axles fitted in them, the wheels and axles together shall be dutiable at the same rate as is provided for the wheels when imported separately.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 38, line 18, after the word "manufactured," strike out "25 per cent ad valorem" and insert "one-fourth cent per pound"; and on the same page, line 20, after the word "manufactured," strike out "10 per cent ad valorem" and insert "1 cent per pound."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, this is essentially a labor proposition. I sit in this House sometimes amazed at the sort of twaddle that is passed out to the public through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as the voice of labor in the United States. It seems to me the time has come when a Member of this House, who is as much a laborer as the man who belongs to a union or the man who stands here assuming to speak for a union or a particular class of workers, ought to be man enough to assert himself. It is an odd thing that one or two men here should always be picked as the real spokesman of labor. Awhile ago we could not quote from Samuel Gompers even without objection when the thing to be quoted disproved what has been said on this floor against the protection of labor.

I said the amendment I offer is a labor proposition. It is a labor proposition, because it not only involves millions of capital but the employment of thousands of men who may or may not belong to labor unions, or may or may not have special spokesmen on this floor, but who have a right to the protection of the law in this country, which my friend from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] said awhile ago they did not need. A little while ago we had read from the Clerk's desk a clipping from some newspaper quoting some crank or other, some new faddist, who intimated that all the people in the insane asylums were people who had toiled in the mills, and by reason of excess of toil had been forced into insanity, when the real truth doubtless is that many of those who get into insane asylums are those who do not have any useful thing to do and who do not give their real share of labor to the common welfare of the land.

I say this amendment is essential to the labor. In Germany and in France these railway wheels, made by honest but ill-paid labor, are protected by the laws of those countries in a manner in which you do not propose to protect them in the Underwood bill. Germany makes it compulsory upon the people to buy railroad wheels of the German manufacturers, and England makes it compulsory upon the people of England to buy the railway wheels made by the workmen of England. And yet in this bill you propose to reduce the rates that have afforded protection to the men who make the wheels in the United States and offer inducements to England and Germany, with cheaper material, to send their material here.

Mr. Chairman, I speak for men who work. I work, and I do not take odds from anyone with regard to the amount of work I do. It is of service to the community, and I am doing my part just as worthily, I hope, as any man who wears a badge or label of any kind; and so it is with every man who earns his salt. He is something of a demagogue who takes any other position. I intend to incorporate in my remarks a statement that comes from men over their own signatures—over 100 of them—men who work in the mills making car wheels, who ask this Congress to protect them in their American occupation against the cheaper labor of England and Germany which some of the professed friends of labor on this floor wish to introduce in order to beat down the American wage.

I append the following letters:

RAILWAY STEEL-SPRING CO., SCOTT WORKS,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 21, 1913.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will find inclosed herewith a petition from the local officers and employees of the Railway Steel-Spring Co., at Philadelphia, Pa., together with signatures of some of the most prominent business men at this point, protesting against the proposed reduction in the tariff on railway tires as covered by the proposed amendment to the tariff in the bill now before Congress, reading as follows:

"Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, made of iron or steel, and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotive, car, or other railway tires or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 25 per cent ad valorem," etc.

There are millions of dollars invested in this industry at various places in this country, and a large number of men are employed in the works at this point. The maximum wages have been paid, and satisfactory labor conditions have prevailed at all times. The present tariff on tires is 1½ cents per pound, and the proposed reduction to 25 per cent ad valorem is a percentage reduction of 64 per cent. We can not help but feel that this is a situation which has not been properly presented to Mr. UNDERWOOD and the other gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee, and this opportunity is taken to inform you of the true facts of the case.

In England and Germany tires are sold at higher prices than are charged by American manufacturers to railroads in the United States.

Canada and Mexico are practically the "dumping grounds" of Europe for the excess production of these materials by European manufacturers,

and it is certain the United States would receive large quantities of these products from England and Germany if the proposed reduction in tariff on tires becomes a law.

England protects its industry by compulsory use of British tires in England and the colonies, while Germany does the same for the German manufacturers by means of a high tariff.

The tire-manufacturing plants in America have been and still are able to produce these materials largely in excess of the American demands for them, and it was in the endeavor of American manufacturers to dispose of their excess production that they learned of the prices prevailing in Canada and Mexico.

We feel that it is but right and just for us to request simply the retention of the present duty on wheels and tires for the purpose of conserving to this country the manufacture and sale of products for which, as above stated, this country is already oversupplied with producing capacity.

In submitting the inclosed petition, therefore, we ask you to use all the means at your command to prevent any reduction whatever in "wheels for railway purposes or parts thereof, etc., or railway tires or parts thereof, etc." as a matter of justice to American tire manufacturers as well as the protection of the large number of workmen employed in this industry.

Respectfully submitted.

RAILWAY STEEL SPRING CO., SCOTT WORKS,
FRED W. HARRIS, Manager.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., April —, 1913.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, residents of your congressional district, hereby respectfully call your attention to the matter of the proposed reduction in the tariff on "wheels for railway purposes and parts thereof, etc., and other railway tires or parts thereof, etc.," now pending before Congress.

The proposed reduction in the tariff on the above-mentioned products would seriously affect one of the most important industries as carried on by the Railway Steel Spring Co. in the city of Philadelphia, and would positively result in the cessation of that company's activities at Philadelphia. It is well known to you that the Railway Steel Spring Co. is one of the best wage-paying factories in Philadelphia, and upon its operation a great many workmen and their families depend.

We therefore earnestly petition you to use all honorable means at your command to prevent the proposed reduction in the tariff on the above-mentioned products.

Charles T. Nichols, F. W. Harris, J. E. Morrison, Edward Williams, Martin T. Convery, Thomas G. Coleman, William Ostertag, Chas. Bohmer, Jas. N. Foster, William H. Desher, sr., Adam Hoover, B. Frank Roland, James McLees, Wm. McConnell, Wm. Isherwood, W. O. Vane, Albert J. Hastings, Geo. W. Dargin, W. H. Desher, jr., Chris. Bersold, Patrick Hughes, James Shepherd, W. Harry Bright, Milton Hersch, John C. Whitman, Abe Rossman, Adolph Otto, H. F. M. Withington, August Lalex, George F. Radford, Thomas Gauden, Frank B. Homan, Frank H. Hughes, John H. Mairs, Leonard Coffin, W. Bright, Chas. McKenney, George F. Moore, William Coffin, James Santime, Walter Schaeffer, Charles Artese, Geo. Brunetti, P. Schmidt, Guido Brunetti, Angelo Dike, Dominico Fressi, Henly Perrow, G. Dare, S. Leaser, J. Schurm, W. C. Ebbert, Joseph Rafman, Pasquale Amato, Lues Segal, Francis McLean, John Merklinger, Joseph W. Lunn, Edward J. Williamson, Theo. G. Rambo, Samuel McCall, James G. Fowkes, P. M. Walton, Thos. H. Rowdall, Chris. Graham, Peter Cremins, Leo Maynas, Henry J. O'Neill, Frank W. Davis, Edward L. Birch, A. Penrose Ambler, William E. Conover, G. Howard Byan, Edward P. Crawford, George Veale, William T. Nichols, H. R. Edwards, Wm. M. Mervine, John H. Wolf, P. L. Frey, H. A. Tripple, John Kloos, J. Donovan, Wesley Miller, Stanly Shultz, William Futz, Yeokule Koll, Max Muntz, Tony Giuseppe, Harry Camenisch.

STANDARD STEEL WORKS CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa., April 22, 1913.

Hon. J. HAMPTON MOORE,

The Raleigh, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Underwood tariff bill, which is before Congress for consideration, contains the following:

"Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, made of iron or steel, and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotive, car, or other railway tires or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 25 per cent ad valorem; ingots, cogged ingots, blooms, or blanks for the same, without regard to the degree of manufacture, 10 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That when wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, of iron or steel, are imported with iron or steel axles fitted in them the wheels and axles together shall be dutiable at the same rate as is provided for the wheels when imported separately."

As manufacturers of the material affected by this portion of the bill we wish to place on record our protest against the reduction of the present tariff relating to the articles mentioned. If the bill passes and becomes a law with the recommendations as contained therein it will not be possible to compete with the importation from Europe. This is proved by our inability to successfully compete with European manufacturers for the sale of tires in Canada, Japan, or South America, where the chances of securing business are equal, the deciding factor being price only. We secure no Canadian business except when the demand is urgent and the time for delivery from Europe is too long. Our information of conditions indicates that the price of tires for home consumption in Europe is higher than the prices charged for tires by American manufacturers to home consumers. England protects its industries by the compulsory use of British tires in England and the colonies, and Germany by high tariff. America would become therefore another dumping ground such as Canada for the excess production. The total productive capacity of American manufacturers is so much in excess of the possible requirements that our plant is never operated to its full capacity. As the plants are not now run to their full capacity every endeavor is made to obtain orders for rings for crushing machinery and commercial uses other than tires for railway purposes in substitution for the same articles ordinarily made of steel castings to assist in the plants' operation to as near maximum capacity as possible, in order to secure the benefit of lowest cost.

It will be clearly apparent, therefore, that the deprivation of business that will surely occur if the bill is enacted can have no other result than an advance in cost due to the lesser quantity produced, increasing thereby the intensity of the already severe competition.

We would suggest the advisability of a specific tariff per pound instead of per centum ad valorem, with its uncertainty of actual amount of tariff and its inducement to improper and untrue statements of price in order to secure lower tariff charges. We especially protest against a lower rate of tariff for "ingots, cogged ingots, blooms or blanks for the same, without regard to degree of manufacture," than is charged for "iron or steel locomotive, car, or other railway tires, or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured," because in the manufacture of tires the process proceeds from the cast ingot to the cogged ingot, to the rolled blank, from which the tire, with but little additional cost, is finally rolled. The sketch attached hereto illustrates the various degrees of manufacture referred to in the bill, indicating clearly the possibility of construing the rolled tire as a blank.

(Sketch not printed in RECORD.)

Therefore a bloom or blank, upon which almost all the cost of manufacturing tires has been placed, could be entered under the 10 per cent clause and do irreparable injury to the tire manufacturers in this country.

We trust the facts herein set forth clearly indicate that it is not our desire to secure a tariff which will permit exorbitant selling price, but, on the contrary, indicate a desire to be granted sufficient protection to insure the acquisition of business which is rightfully ours, with the reasonable profit to which we are justly entitled.

Will you be good enough to acknowledge receipt, advising if we may expect your support toward preventing any reduction in the present tariff on the articles mentioned.

Yours, very truly,

STANDARD STEEL WORKS CO.,
ROBERT RADFORD, Secretary.

P. S.—The present tariff is 1½ cents per pound on tires and 1 cent per pound on the ingots from which they might be made.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. BUTLER. Upon what?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That this amendment is essentially a labor proposition. It would be very laborious for me, and I believe it would be so for 99 per cent of the Members present, to determine whether his amendment, proposing to place a specific duty on these materials in place of an ad valorem duty, as fixed in the bill, will increase or decrease the rate of duty proposed by the committee. Inasmuch as the gentleman has refrained from imparting or has withheld from the committee the needed information as to whether this proposed specific duty would result in an increase of the duty fixed in the bill or a decrease in the duty fixed in the bill, it is a matter of labor for the Members to ascertain for themselves whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is intending to increase or to decrease the rate proposed.

Those of us who have not had the advantage of the information furnished to the gentleman from Pennsylvania from the protected industries of his State, which have so long fattened at the expense of the people, and those of us who have not been able to devote all of their time and energy to tariff questions and to public duties so as to be worn to a frazzle, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania happens to be, can not tell offhand whether a specific rate proposed will increase this definite ad valorem rate or decrease it. I desire to exercise some intelligence in voting upon the amendments that are proposed. I can only assume from the conduct of the gentleman from Pennsylvania heretofore that, no matter what rate may be proposed in this bill, it is not sufficiently high to satisfy him, and that he really intends to increase the proposed rate, whether he gives any information from which that conclusion may be drawn.

Some time I should like to go quite fully into some of the questions raised by the gentleman. Congress some years ago provided that the Government should purchase armor plate, manufactured in the gentleman's own State, from American manufacturers. They have frequently taken advantage of the Government to foist upon it, for the protection of the ships designed for the defense of the country, armor plate that was absolutely worthless.

They have resorted to all kinds of tricks and devices to deceive and mislead the inspectors furnished by the Government to protect the Government. Serious questions have at times been raised as to whether the armor of the ships that have been provided for the defense of the country and armored with the armor plate manufactured in the gentleman's State was of such a character as to afford the protection intended.

Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires some of his industries to furnish all of the parts for the rolling stock of our transportation companies, and thus place not only those who are enlisted to defend the country, but the general public, in the power of some of the not overscrupulous manufacturers for whom he has been so assiduously working during the consideration of this bill.

In some respects the consideration of this bill has been very edifying and educating. For the first time—either in my experience or in the experience of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, or in the experience of the gentleman from Wyoming, or that of some of the other gentlemen who have been criticizing

several items of the bill in their endeavor to ascertain the logic or the reasoning which influenced the Committee on Ways and Means in fixing in the bill certain rates—has a tariff bill been read by the House so that it can be considered by the Committee of the Whole.

I am inclined to believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is the first time that many of these gentlemen have either heard read, or read themselves, any tariff bill that has ever been enacted into law. Their own party never gave them an opportunity to question the men in charge of a tariff bill as to the particular reasons influencing the committee that prepared the bill in placing the duties at one rate or another. Their bills were considered under a special rule, which provided that the Committee on Ways and Means at any time might offer amendments to any part of the bill, and thus the bill was never read, and the gentlemen never had an opportunity either to offer amendments themselves or to question those who represented them as to their reasons for fixing particular rates. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] says this is the first time an opportunity has been granted to Members of the House to read a tariff bill. It is strange that the gentleman from New York has not taken advantage of the opportunity, if this is the first time; but evidently he has not. If he had taken advantage of the opportunity to read the bill and examine the report of the committee, he would not have needed to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] whether his proposition meant an increase in the ad valorem rate, because the committee, endeavoring to give information for the benefit of the House, which was wasted on the gentleman from New York, however, gives the information that under the existing rate, which is now proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], the ad valorem would be at least double what is proposed in this bill. The gentleman should read the report.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That would involve labor.

Mr. BUTLER. A well-deserved rebuke! [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Well, perhaps it is labor for the gentleman. I apprehend that he is so accustomed to bringing in appropriation bills without any information in his report that he considers that nobody examines the reports of committees in the House. Evidently he has not examined at all the report on this bill. Possibly he does not know even that the committee made a report to the House.

Mr. Chairman, unless the antidumping clause acts as a protective measure, this reduction of the duty on car wheels will to a large extent destroy the car-wheel industry in the United States. I do not know whether there will be sufficient protection under the antidumping clause to protect the industry or not. That is a matter of estimate. It may be that it will protect. In the other countries, outside of England and Germany, the industries are to a large extent driven out of those countries by the surplus from Germany and England being dumped upon them, England protecting itself by a positive requirement that the wheels or tires shall be of English construction, and Germany protecting itself by a prohibitory tax. We propose, barring the antidumping clause, to admit the products of their factories practically free, or at a greatly reduced rate, into the United States.

In connection with my remarks I will insert some further information upon this subject, knowing that it is useless to give it to the House otherwise, the Democrats having determined that there shall be no amendment proposed from this side of the House accepted by them. It would be useless to give any information to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. Usually independent, usually somewhat progressive, he is bound feet and arms, and he is gagged, except to abuse or criticize this side of the House. His vote is delivered in advance. He dare not on any proposition vote for an amendment submitted by this side of the House or vote against his own side of the House. He conducts bills in the House which are considered on their merits. It is unusual for the gentleman from New York to be so bound, but now he is bound like my colleague from Illinois over on the other side [Mr. BUCHANAN], whom I see rising to his feet.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that if he will offer any amendment that has merit and can furnish information that will convince any reasonable person I will be glad to vote for his amendment.

Mr. MANN. I have offered some amendments and have furnished reasonable information.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman imagines that. It is not a fact. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I offered amendments a year ago which the gentleman, along with his party, voted against, decried them, said

they ought not to go in the bill. Yet when the bill is brought in this year it contains the very provisions which I then offered and which the gentleman, after receiving the information, voted against a year ago. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I insert as a part of my remarks the following letters relating to this subject:

RAILWAY STEEL SPRING CO., PULLMAN WORKS,
Pullman, Ill., April 18, 1913.

HON. JAMES R. MANN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You will find inclosed herewith a petition from the local officers and employees of the Railway Steel Spring Co., at Pullman, Ill., together with signatures of some of the most prominent business men at this point, protesting against the proposed reduction in the tariff on railway tires, as covered by the proposed amendment to the tariff in the bill now before Congress, reading as follows:

"Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, made of iron or steel, and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotives, car, or other railway tires, or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 25 per cent ad valorem," etc.

There are millions of dollars invested in this industry at various places in this country and a large number of men employed in the works at this point. The maximum wages have been paid and satisfactory labor conditions have prevailed at all times.

The present tariff on tires is 1½ cents per pound, and the proposed reduction to 25 per cent ad valorem is a percentage reduction of 64 per cent. We can not help but feel that this is a situation which has not been properly presented to Mr. UNDERWOOD and the other gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee, and this opportunity is taken to inform you of the true facts of the case.

In England and Germany tires are sold at a higher price than are charged by American manufacturers to the railroads in the United States.

Canada and Mexico are practically the "dumping grounds" of Europe for the excess production of these materials by European manufacturers, and it is certain the United States would receive large quantities of these products from England and Germany if the proposed reduction in tariff on tires becomes a law.

England protects its industry by compulsory use of British tires in England and the colonies, while Germany does the same for German manufactures by means of a high tariff.

The tire-manufacturing plants in America have been and still are able to produce these materials largely in excess of the American demand for them, and it was in the endeavor of American manufacturers to dispose of their excess production that they learned of the prices prevailing in Canada and Mexico.

We feel that it is but right and just for us to request the retention of the present duty on wheels and tires, for the purpose of conserving to this country the manufacture and sale of products for which, as above stated, this country is already oversupplied with producing capacity.

In submitting the inclosed petition, therefore, we ask you to use all the means at your command to prevent any reduction whatever in "Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, etc., or railway tires, or parts thereof, etc.," as a matter of justice to American tire manufacturers, as well as the protection of the large number of workmen employed in this industry.

Respectfully submitted.

JACOB C. PFIEFFER.

PULLMAN, ILL., April 18, 1913.

HON. JAMES R. MANN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned, residents of your congressional district, hereby respectfully call your attention to the matter of the proposed reduction in the tariff on "Wheels for railway purposes and parts thereof, * * * and other railway tires or parts thereof, etc.," now pending before Congress.

The proposed reduction in the tariff on the above-mentioned products would seriously affect one of the most important industries as carried on by the Railway Steel Spring Co., in the town of Pullman, and would positively result in the cessation of that company's activities at Pullman. It is well known to you that the Railway Steel Spring Co. is one of the best wage-paying factories in Pullman, and upon its operation a great many workmen and their families depend.

We therefore earnestly petition you to use all honorable means at your command to prevent the proposed reduction in the tariff on the above-mentioned products.

Edward F. Bryant, Marcus A. Aurelius, Claude R. Egan, Donald R. Bryant, Paul E. Pearson, Allan M. Summers, Paul N. Dahlin, A. C. Caldwell, E. M. Sweeney, 11313 Forest Avenue; F. W. French, 11419 Prairie Avenue; T. A. Kennedy, president Kennedy Laundry & Supply Co.; F. Wolff, 26 Arcade Building, Pullman; P. B. Tread, 237 East One hundred and thirteenth Street, Chicago; J. C. Ferrin, 28-30 Arcade Building; C. A. Gillespie, 11110 Indiana Avenue, Chicago; L. H. Jahn, 11339 Stephenson Avenue; Charles H. Meir, 11340 Prairie Avenue, Chicago; L. J. Johnston, 11340 Prairie Avenue, Chicago; W. H. Armand, 10-11 Market Building, Chicago; Julius Spamer, jr., 11224 Stephenson Avenue, Chicago; O. G. Lindberg, 367 East One hundred and seventeenth Street; E. E. Thompson, Market Building, Pullman; A. J. Hoetstra, 11313 Cottage Grove Avenue; James B. McLachlan, 11201 Cottage Grove Avenue; H. J. Donahue, 11450 Michigan Avenue; Louis Crouse, 11445 Michigan Avenue; F. T. Loneks, 11439 Michigan Avenue; Martin R. Lynn, 11855 State Street; J. H. Walsh, 11401 Michigan Avenue; L. W. Kahn, 4710 Grand Boulevard; C. M. Hanan, 11400 Michigan Avenue; H. W. Hoffman, 12109 Butler Street; Robert Elliott, 11541 Stewart Avenue; Isidore Frank, 11403 Prairie Avenue; Louis A. Schmid, 11324 Michigan Avenue; Charles Lauer, 11233 Michigan Avenue; Nels O. Larson, 11320 Indiana Avenue; Charles Peorie, 115 West One hundred and eleventh Place; F. C. Bendt, 11420 Prairie Avenue; I. J. Stram 10733 Carty Avenue; H. Holm, 233 West One hundred and tenth Street; Emil Wumerberg, 11156 Curtis Avenue; H. B. Ludwig,

11334 Curtis Avenue; George J. Phillips, 11138 Michigan Avenue; John G. Deckelman, 48 West One hundred and twelfth Street; H. Hagel, 114 West One hundred and thirteenth Street; A. Hammerstrom, 11144 Curtis Avenue; R. A. Dean, 625 East One hundred and twelfth Street; Frank O. Ernst, 11410 Indiana Avenue; J. C. Wares, 11333 Prairie Avenue; Jos. W. Cannon, 11333 Indiana Avenue; Albert Holmberg, 11328 Prairie Avenue; Wm. Guthardt, 59 West One hundred and thirteenth Street; Ben Budka, 236 West One hundred and thirteenth Street; Wm. I. Sherwood, 302 West One hundred and twelfth Place; Elmer E. Carlson, 11254 Michigan Avenue; G. Z. Carver, 29 West One hundred and fourteenth Street; Paul F. Neidhardt, 11820 Eggleston Avenue; John J. Kunst, 20 East One hundred and twelfth Place; Thomas J. Ryan, 29 East One hundred and twelfth Place; Glenn G. Perry, 11824 Lowe Avenue; Jos. Gannon, 11214 Stephenson Street; C. Wm. Akerman, 11421 Prairie Avenue; George J. Scheldt, 120-121 Lowe Avenue; Michael Fox, 3247 Ninety-first Street; M. J. Ryan, 11118 Curtis Avenue; J. Van Bruggen, 61 West One hundred and tenth Place; George Noble, 1101 Michigan Avenue; Herman Pott, 245 West One hundred and fifth Place; John Johnson, 21 West One hundred and twelfth Place; Joe Zakouski, Block E, Room 14; E. A. Frazin, 11717 Parnell Avenue; George Lind, 10738 Stephenson Avenue; G. Ritz, 135 East One hundred and thirty-fifth Place; S. Benscholt, 11317 Eggleston Avenue; C. Appel, 126 East One hundred and fourteenth Place; John Ahearn, 7331 Greenwood Avenue; Alfred Eckborg, 56 West One hundred and twelfth Street; Wm. Zellinger, 346 West One hundred and ninth Street; Frank W. Lounsbery, 9322 Washington Avenue; Jacob C. Pfeiffer, 11322 Prairie Avenue; John Holck, 12046 Wallace Street; August Orne, 10530 Erickson Avenue; John Doodeman, 11624 Yale Avenue; Albert Crouse, 21 West One hundred and tenth Place; H. C. Knudsen, 11120 Indiana Avenue.

ATLANTA, GA., April 12, 1913.

HON. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This will advise that the writer was requested some months ago, by some personal friends interested in the manufacture of car wheels and car-wheel springs, to file an argument and brief before the House Ways and Means Committee and call attention to certain baneful consequences which would probably result if any change was made in the tariff duties on these products.

This the writer proceeded to do, and said brief and argument was filed with the Ways and Means Committee on or about February 7 last. I quote for your information extract from customs-tariff act of August 5, 1909, covering the rates of duties on these products:

"PAR. 171. Wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, made of iron or steel, and steel-tired wheels for railway purposes, whether wholly or partly finished, and iron or steel locomotive, car, or other railway tires or parts thereof, wholly or partly manufactured, 1½ cents per pound; ingots, cogged ingots, blooms or blanks for the same, without regard to the degree of manufacture, 1 cent per pound.

"Provided, That when wheels for railway purposes, or parts thereof, of iron or steel, are imported with iron or steel axles fitted in them, the wheels and axles together shall be dutiable at the same rate as is provided for the wheels when imported separately."

I understood at the time that certain changes in these duties were under consideration by said committee, and it was to lay the matter properly before the committee that the argument was filed.

I am advised that the principal foreign competing manufacturing plants are located in England and Germany, and I am further advised that the German tariff on the imports of these products into that country is expressly prohibitive, and that this was done to prevent competition from American-made goods.

I am further advised that in England there is a law which requires the users of these products to purchase the same from manufacturing concerns located in England or her colonies.

These two very important points were amplified in my argument before the committee, and it seems to me should have been conclusive on the subject matter.

As a result of the situation growing out of said laws in England and Germany, it is not a question of rates of duty so much as it is to protect the American manufacturer against foreign laws evidently passed for the purpose of preventing importation of these goods and competition from America.

I respectfully call your attention to my argument, which you will find in the printed reports of the committee under the iron and steel schedule.

I am now advised that there is a company of considerable size manufacturing these products in your district, located at Pullman. For that reason your constituents are interested in this particular matter, and I call it to your attention with the earnest request that if it meets with your approval you do what you can in Congress when this phase of the tariff bill comes up for consideration to properly present the above facts to the entire Congress, as they strike me with great force, and, in my judgment, are controlling on the subject matter, as stated above.

Very truly, yours,

H. N. RANDOLPH.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. PALMER. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

Mr. FARR. I should like five minutes.

Mr. PALMER. Then I will make it 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, for the purpose of getting information—I shall not object to the request—what

is the intention in reference to the evening, and if we have an evening session, as to the time of taking the recess?

Mr. PALMER. I understand that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] desires to recess from half past 6 until half past 7, and then complete the metal schedule to-night.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that last night, with the recess an hour and a quarter long, there was nobody in the House when we reassembled, and I think a recess of an hour and a quarter is a little too short.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that I do not want to cut off anybody in the House. I want this bill to have full opportunity to be discussed, and I know it is natural that we should get into political debates on a tariff bill. If the gentleman is willing to urge his friends on that side of the House that after supper we shall confine our remarks to the schedule, I will do the same, and I am willing, when this 10 minutes' debate is over, to take a recess.

Mr. MANN. This side of the House has not violated the rule in that respect as much as the other side has.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think both sides have wandered into the realm of politics.

Mr. MANN. It might keep them from wandering some, but I think no one can criticize the action of the minority on this bill where we could delay or force the gentlemen on the other side of the House to bring in a rule.

Mr. PALMER. Except where they want the discussion reported when they have been out to lunch and have not heard it. [Laughter.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have no criticism to make of the gentleman's side of the House. I am allowing the bill to be read for their benefit, as we have largely made up our minds on it. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is allowing us to read the bill in order to escape the criticism of bringing in a rule to encourage the gentleman from New York to say how liberal you have been. I do not criticize the gentleman for taking that attitude.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think if we brought in a rule on our side of the House without at least giving the minority an opportunity to fairly consider the bill we would be subject to just criticism. If, on the other hand, a situation was forced upon the House so that we could not get the bill through, I would not hesitate to bring in a rule.

Mr. MANN. I understand the situation, I think, on both sides of the House. Politically speaking, we would rather have you bring in the rule, but, on the other hand, we have no desire to take an unfair advantage or force a rule as long as there is a reasonable amount of debate allowed. It seems to me that after we use up these 10 minutes we might easily take a recess until 8 o'clock.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would ask the gentleman if we could not "swap tobacco between lines" and hold the debate down to the schedules?

Mr. MANN. I have not indulged in any of it. I have discussed only the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Except when the gentleman was referring to me. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I was discussing the car-wheel proposition entirely. [Laughter.] The gentleman from New York did not know anything about it, and I was trying to give him information. Of course it was useless. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Will not the gentleman from Alabama make the time 15 minutes before closing debate on this paragraph? I would like 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am willing to let the debate run 15 minutes if we can come to an understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama modifies his request, and moves that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] may lead some gentlemen to believe that I was assuming to be the special representative of organized labor, and that there were only two or three of us who were capable of representing labor. I would like to say for his information, and for the information of others, that I have not been officially connected with organized labor for about eight years. I served as an official of organized labor for a number of years, and I tried to serve them well.

I took the position with reference to organized labor then that I take now—that organized labor's interest and the interest of honest, legitimate business and capital are one. The position that I take in representing labor in Congress is that anybody that does anything that is useful is doing labor. I do not confine the labor to those that work with their hands only. Those that are working in their own business; that are

working with their brain, doing clerical work or working in any capacity, doing useful work, are, from my point of view, working people.

The Democrats who controlled this House in the Sixty-second Congress, and a number of those elected on the Republican ticket, demonstrated that they were in sympathy with the demands of organized labor by passing legislation requested by the representatives of organized labor that had been defeated by the Republicans, who had been in the majority of the House for the last 16 years. The Democratic House responded to the appeals of organized labor because they were reasonable and only asked for just and equitable legislation. Some of the measures passed by the House died in the Senate and some were vetoed by the Republican President. Labor is hopeful now of securing the passage of remedial legislation for the working masses, because the Democratic Party is in full control of Congress, and we have a real people's President in the White House.

When you talk to me about "labor's interest" and about "capital's interest," as though they were different and distinct, I say to you that the great problems confronting the people will not be solved until they are considered from the point of view of the best interests of the whole people, because honest legitimate business and commercialism can not be separated from the interests of labor. The people of this country are suffering from the burdens of financial and commercial piracy, which has resulted in floating on the industries of this country about \$40,000,000,000 of watered stock, or fictitious and counterfeit capital, which is bearing heavy on the shoulders of the great masses of the people.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. The gentleman will observe that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] admitted that under this high protective system the insane asylums of the country are full of men who are out of work.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman certainly does not mean to say that.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have not the time to yield, as I have only five minutes. Those who know the industrial conditions know that the drift of industrial conditions is such as tend to impair the physical and mental ability of the working people of the country, because the so-called captains of industry through their greed for profit on counterfeit capital and fictitious valuations have disregarded the rights and interests of humanity.

Mr. Chairman, I was elected to this Congress on the Democratic ticket, and was elected on a platform declaring for a reduction of the tariff or a tariff for revenue only. In my district I am well known to be opposed to the protective-tariff policy, and favor a tariff for revenue only to obtain revenue for the expense of the Government economically administered. I do not try to deceive anyone in regard to my position, and if they do not know it, it is not because I have not stated it plainly and bluntly. The trade-union people of the country by their associations and exchanges of ideas are better educated than those who have not organized in the country, and in my opinion the large majority of them are opposed to the protective-tariff policy. The party that is advocating that policy had refused, when it was in power in this Congress, to give them the remedial legislation that they asked and worked for for so many years. The Democratic Party, however, having pledged in its platform that it would pass legislation for the eight-hour day and other legislation that the trade-unions required for the protection of the rights and interests of the wageworkers, has fulfilled its promise and has passed about every measure that has been asked by representatives of the great organized labor movement of this country.

I insert here an article published in the Chicago Record-Herald of May 1, 1913, written by Stoughton Cooley, who is an able student of economic conditions:

(By Stoughton Cooley.)

Seldom have justice and expediency been in closer accord than in the plea of American seamen for relief from antiquated rules and regulations that govern modern seafaring life.

It has puzzled a great many persons to know why the American merchant marine, protected and hedged about as it is by all the laws its friends could devise, should have failed to prosper along with other industries. American tonnage in 1800 was half as great as that of Great Britain—970,000 and 1,856,000 tons respectively—and continued to grow by leaps and bounds until in 1860 America had 5,350,000 tons, while England, including her colonies, had barely 5,713,000. Yet, in 1910 the American tonnage had fallen to 5,058,678, while that of England had mounted to 19,012,294 tons.

TONNAGE ON DECLINE.

Nor do these striking figures convey the full measure of our shipping's decline. Less than one-sixth of the tonnage flying the Amer-

ican flag, or 782,517 tons, is engaged in the overseas trade, the remaining five-sixths being employed in the coastwise trade. Our navigation laws absolutely prohibit foreign vessels from engaging in the coasting trade.

In 1860, 69 per cent of our exports and imports were carried under the American flag; in 1870 the proportion had fallen to 35 per cent; in 1880, to 18 per cent; and in 1911, of our foreign trade, the greatest in the world and amounting to \$3,576,546,304, less than 9 per cent was carried in American ships. With but four steamships to Europe and four to the Orient flying the American flag we have come to a pitiable pass.

TARIFF FURNISHES ANSWER.

What has brought this once great industry to this condition? Why should other enterprises advance while the shipping industry decays?

The answer lies in that much discussed and still unsolved question, the tariff. When protection to the iron industry raised the price of rails and locomotives the increase was added to the freight rates and the shipper paid it. He had no other choice. But when this higher priced iron was used in a ship the freights could not be advanced to cover it, for the reason that the shipper had an alternative; he could employ English ships.

But American shipping was not allowed to decay without efforts on the part of Congress to revive it. Many investigations were made and a multitude of laws proposed and discussed.

FREE SHIPS, FREE MEN.

The sum total of these investigations seems to have established the fact that an American ship costs more to build than an English ship. To remove this handicap it has been proposed to allow American shipmasters to buy ships abroad.

The friends of the tariff say this would be ineffective for the reason that the difference in the wages of seamen makes it more expensive to operate an American ship. To meet this condition they have asked that the Government aid the shipbuilder, the shipmaster, and the seamen by means of a large subsidy. But the people will not submit to a subsidy. Nor are they content to see the flag disappear from the high seas.

But the key to the situation is unexpectedly put in the hands of Congress by the sailors. To the plea for free ships they add a plea for free men. Free ships and free men will restore the flag to the high seas.

SEAMEN UNDER "SLAVERY."

That free ships will equalize the cost of ships is plain; that free seamen will overcome the difference in the cost of operation will be apparent upon a moment's reflection.

The navigation laws of nations maintain a species of slavery among seamen that has come down to us from the rude age when the line between buccaneering and legitimate commerce was shifting and indistinct.

Serfdom on land has long since disappeared, even in Russia; but serfdom on the sea remains. The man who ships on a vessel is bound to her by all the power of the Army and Navy. He must sign a contract, and should he attempt to quit his job, even when the ship is safe in port, he is seized like a felon, put aboard in irons, and held till the ship goes to sea.

Naturally, such a law has been abused. Human nature could not resist the temptation. It has been abused to such a degree that the American seaman has disappeared along with the American ship.

MEN DEMAND JUSTICE.

Self-respecting men now go to sea only when no other means of livelihood is to be found, so that the few ships we still have are manned for the most part by foreigners.

For years the American seaman has been appealing to Congress for relief. Last February a bill was passed repealing the compulsory servitude laws and otherwise ameliorating conditions in the forecabin, but it failed of Mr. Taft's signature and will have to be reenacted.

Justice alone demands that the men be granted this relief. But in this, as in all other cases, justice turns out to be the most expedient. The law that permits the shipping of a crew in a foreign port where wages are low and prevents them from leaving the ship in a port where wages are high puts it in the power of the foreign shipmaster to underbid the American shipmaster.

NAVY NEEDS DEFINED.

But grant the men the right to quit when the ship is in port. Then a ship coming to our ports with a cheap crew would be unable to leave until it paid American wages. And rather than submit to this trouble and delay the shipmaster would pay American wages all the time. With ships and crews at equal cost, would the American shipmaster need anything more to induce him again to unfurl the flag on the high seas?

We talk of a larger Navy, but of what use are ships without men to man them and coalers to coal them? When our battleships made their spectacular voyage around the world they were coaled by foreign ships. And had hostilities broken out suddenly not one of the 27 coalers would have dared approach the fleet. Our Navy is already short of officers and men, and it is becoming more and more difficult to man the ships. Is this a thing to be treated lightly?

SEAMEN'S BILL URGED.

It was the Navy that performed indispensable service in 1776 and saved the country from complete annihilation in the War of 1812, and it was the Navy that made possible the preservation of the Union in 1861. But in those times the seas fairly swarmed with American ships and sailors, the best ships and the best men to be found under any flag, as was proven time and again in actual clash of arms.

What a pitiable showing we should make to-day if suddenly called on to meet such an emergency!

The seamen's bill is drawn with a view of making life at sea as tolerable as life ashore. It provides that the Government, instead of the shipowners, shall issue the certificates of efficiency to the men; that a certain percentage of the crew shall be composed of efficient seamen; and that the seaman shall have the right to leave his ship when it is safe in port.

With free ships and free men there is no doubt as to the future of the American merchant marine.

The argument here contained can not be successfully denied. The wage workers of the country have the scum removed from their eyes and the cobwebs from their brains, and they will no longer permit the agents of the tariff barons of the country to deceive them by their old threadbare worn argument that the

tariff protects the workingman. Such argument is a delusion and a snare and is an insult to the intelligence of the working people.

The tariff, from its historical origin and even in its name, is a survival of piracy, and the object and purpose for which it has been maintained since the War between the States has been for the industry of the Republic to hand over an increasing proportion of its earnings to a group of men organized in a more or less conscious conspiracy to promote their own aggrandizement at the expense of their fellow citizens.

Naturally, the people think that a tariff is necessary to raise public revenue; but the people of the country have paid annually about two thousand millions of dollars more for the things they use and consume than they would have been required to pay for the same in a free market. The greatest share of revenue accruing to the Government in any one year under the tariff system and from the tariff was approximately \$333,000,000. The difference between this sum received by the Government and the total cost of the system to the people, approximately \$1,615,000,000, has been the annual tribute levied upon industry by tariff beneficiaries, and this sum has come largely from the class whose industry produced the small return, the laboring man, who is not, has not been, and can not be protected by any form of tariff, and the farmer, who could derive no benefit from the tariff.

Twenty years ago 50 per cent of our international commerce consisted of agricultural products in one form or another, which total international commerce constituted about 5 per cent of the total commerce of the Republic; therefore, 2½ per cent, or one-fortieth of our total commerce, determined commercial prices for our entire circle of exchange. The tariff on the statute books, ostensibly for the benefit of the farmer, became a nullity at the customhouse, since the volume of our agricultural surplus was disposed of in free markets abroad, which determined the value of domestic consumption. The price of wool, cotton, packing-house products, and other farm and agricultural products were determined in the great consuming centers abroad.

We were exporters and still are exporters of such produce and not importers. However, the natural laws of trade form themselves, regardless of human interference and the penalties borne by the farmer for the last two generations, have begun to impose their vengeance on the Republic in the shape of a high cost of living, with men driven out of agriculture by its excessive penalties under the tariff which compels them to sell in the free markets and buy under tariff protection. It has driven men out of agriculture and into employment of a different kind until the margin of surplus of agricultural produce beyond consumption has about reached the vanishing point.

It is difficult to speak temperately of a system which has produced such diabolical results. It is even more difficult to speak temperately with reference to the infatuated blindness of a people that has permitted it.

The necessity of a tariff as a matter of protection to American industry has long since disappeared. The cost per unit of production of articles manufactured in America is appreciably less than that of the same commodity in any other country. The actual basis for the demand for a tariff is not the necessity to cover the difference in wages between America and other countries, but in order that form and substance may be given to an inflation of American securities. An industry, the total value of which in invested capital amounts to practically \$5,000,000, is by a process of concentration, amalgamation, and combination capitalized at about \$25,000,000, and in order to float it—move it in the exchanges—it is necessary to show dividends on the exaggerated capital; therefore it begins by the prevention of competition to raise the market prices for its products and to lower the cost of its manufacture both in the price of material and in the cost of labor. It will be cheerfully admitted that much of the artificial and fictitious capital now paraded on the stock exchanges of the country as solid values will disappear when the power to levy unearned tribute is destroyed.

Aside from the economic evils which have accompanied like a shadow the abuses of the system, the social and moral consequences are even more deplorable and enduring. The people may recover from a period of industrial stagnation, but they can not so easily overcome the results of moral degeneration. Whenever a citizen is allured by the prospect of sharing the loot into supporting the iniquitous system, becoming thereby a participator in the crime itself, the transition for spoliation of the innocent general public to the appropriation of individual properties is very natural and easy. It is an established principle that whosoever secures something of value for nothing, and without equivalent return, is economically and morally a thief; and there is a class of minds developed under the stress

and strain of economic pressure, a natural consequence of the artificial system, which naturally believes that any form of injustice may not only be legalized, but sanctified by act of Congress.

The eagle was the emblem of Roman genius and is the emblem of American spirit. It may not have occurred to those who chose this symbolism that the later history of the Republic amply justifies the selection of this royal bird as its emblem. It is the habit of the eagle to lie in wait until the osprey by vigilance and industry shall have captured a supply of food, which capture is the immediate signal for activity on the part of the eagle, who darts from his lofty perch and seizes upon the fish caught by the osprey. Under our magnificent system our captains of finance find it much more simple, instead of creating wealth themselves, to wait until others have created it and then, by artful processes legalized under our system, to appropriate it to their own use.

It is doubtful if any argument, statement of facts, tabulation of statistics, social, moral, or industrial deductions from our experience as a people will have weight or power to change opinions already fixed. The only hope is that by the agitation of the question there may be an increasing number who are not the official exponents, but rather the coefficients of public opinion, whose ideas may be developed along the lines of justice and truth.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing the paragraph with reference to car wheels. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has illustrated how the interest of labor is involved in this paragraph. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] complains because we insist upon calling attention, as these rates are reduced, to the danger of loss of employment and reduction of wages to the American workman, and while he is complaining because we do call attention to the danger which the workman is in owing to this legislation he insists that we have no interest in the welfare of the laboring man. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] is going to vote for this bill. No one will ever know, I assume, what are his views as to the particular paragraphs and items in the bill, for he has transferred to his agents, the Committee on Ways and Means, authority to act for him, and eventually he will vote as the caucus bound him to vote. This is what he will vote for. He calls himself a friend of labor, and I think he is a friend of labor, and a sincere friend of labor, but he is not the only one on earth, I will suggest to the gentleman. This is the bill he is going to vote for, a bill that on the showing made by its proponents, its authors, is to transfer at least \$146,000,000 of production from our shores to foreign shores.

Based upon the ordinary percentage of labor entering into production, that means transferring at least one hundred to one hundred and twenty-five millions annually of opportunity to labor from our country to foreign shores, and at the end of three years, when the free-sugar provision goes into effect, it means the transfer of at least \$75,000,000 more of labor opportunity to foreign shores. Will the gentleman from Illinois kindly inform us what he expects the men to do who are now engaged in those gainful productions which are, according to report of the majority on this bill, to be transferred abroad? Where are those men to find employment when they lose it by the transfer of production to foreign shores, as the committee has said they will if this bill becomes a law?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I can not yield at this time. The gentleman knows as well as any man on this floor that this is a fact, that whatever else you may say of this bill there is not a man under the flag, there is not an enterprise in the country that expects to have an additional wheel turn, an additional machine operate, an additional opportunity for a day of labor through the passage of this bill.

No laboring man in America believes that the passage of this bill will increase his wages. I doubt if there is a man anywhere laboring in a mill or in a mine, or in a factory or on the farm, who has the slightest idea that the passage of this bill will give him an additional day's work or increase the rewards of his labor. The most you can hope for and the most you can promise is that by impoverishing the farmers of the country you may be able to make the living of the laboring man in the city a little cheaper. That is all anyone can promise under this legislation, and even that promise can not be fulfilled without bringing distress to a large portion of our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I hope the general apprehension as to the effects of this bill on the country will not be realized. I am certain that as a Republican I shall not want anything to happen to this grand country. It is no compensation to have

our industries and their employees injured by the enactment of this bill. I have a case here for which I can appeal to those who specially appeal for labor. It is an opportunity to save an industry that employs male labor—

Mr. AUSTIN. May I ask the gentleman if he is not a member of a labor organization?

Mr. FARR. I am a member of a labor organization. The industry to which I now refer employs male labor. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] I know is sincere concerning labor, and he speaks of the pathetic conditions that prevail, I regret to say, in some industries; yet by his vote he is willing to stop the wheels from turning in this country and have those go in foreign countries, where wages are one-half and less than they are in this country and the cost of living on the same standard just as much.

If industrial conditions are bad in places in this country, how must they be across the ocean, where wages are so much lower and hours longer? Shall we benefit industrial conditions in this country by permitting foreign-made tires and other goods coming into this country and taking the labor away from our people? The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], which I would have offered had he not, to retain the present duty, the duty in the Payne bill in this new bill—the Underwood bill—ought to prevail. I am sure the gentleman could not have seriously considered this schedule and reduced the percentage 64 per cent, inviting serious injury, if not destruction, to this industry. We are selling these tires in this country for 3½ cents per pound. They are sold in Germany at 4 cents a pound and in England at 4 cents a pound. We can not ship any of our goods over to Germany on account of the high tariff, and we can not sell to England on account of some compulsory rule that forces English consumers to use English-made goods, and they dump those goods in Canada, and our people can not go into Canada on account of the preferential duty in favor of England. We have developed splendid industries for the making of these tires in Pennsylvania, Missouri, Illinois, New York, Michigan, Tennessee, and other places. Let us maintain it and help its further upbuilding.

Mr. HARDWICK. What is that rule of which the gentleman speaks?

Mr. AUSTIN. And some in Tennessee.

Mr. FARR. Yes. The rule adopted by England protects its industries by the compulsory use of their products in England and their colonies.

Mr. HARDWICK. Where does the gentleman get that?

Mr. FARR. It is in this petition. So, gentlemen, if you want to favor labor you should retain this duty and continue this industry, and the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee ought to give this subject additional consideration. Officers and employees of the industry in Scranton have signed an urgent petition against this heavy reduction in the tariff on tires. I know they would not have done so but for their earnest belief that there was danger to that industry. Now, we talk about labor in this country. I am a labor man. I served my time and worked hard in a printing office, passing from newsboy, devil in the office, and afterwards printer and a city editor. There is no country on God's footstool that offers the opportunity that this glorious Nation does to the working people, and there is no country where such consideration is given to human welfare and the happiness of men and women and children as in this country.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. FARR. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. About how many men work in this shop?

Mr. FARR. About 8,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. If you will stop some of the immigrants coming in here—

Mr. FARR. How would the gentleman have been here himself if they had stopped his parents from coming here?

I shall submit as a part of my remarks a statement made before the Ways and Means Committee by a representative of the Scranton Railway Steel Spring Co., relative to the present tariffs on the products under discussion, to wit, iron and steel wheels for railway purposes and tires, as follows:

The investment in this business in the United States is approximately \$25,000,000. The plants are located in the States of Illinois, Missouri, Pennsylvania, New York, Michigan, and Colorado. It is estimated that employment is given 8,000 men in this industry.

If any change is made in the existing tariff of a material nature, it would not be possible for the manufacturers of these products in the United States to compete with importations of similar products from Europe. This is proven by the fact that they are now unable to successfully compete with the European manufacturers for the exportation of these articles to Canada, where the opportunities for securing this

business are equal, and the deciding factor should be one of price only. At the present time the United States manufacturers are unable to secure any business except when the demand is urgent and it is impossible to await delivery from Europe.

Investigation will show that prices for home consumption of these products in Europe are higher than the prices charged by American manufacturers of these same products to home consumers. In England and Germany tires are sold at upward of 4 cents per pound; in the United States at from 3 to 3½ cents per pound, and in no case as high as 4 cents per pound. Canada and Mexico are practically the dumping grounds of Europe for the excess production of these materials by European manufacturers, and it is certain that the United States would likewise become the dumping ground of these same products from the same sources if any material reduction was made in duties.

England protects its industry by compulsory use of British tires in England and the colonies, and Germany by high tariff. At the present time the production of these materials from the plants in the United States is largely in excess of the American demands. This fact has already reduced the price which these manufacturers can obtain for their goods to a much lower basis than the importance of the business demands and would justify, and if, in addition to this, they were confronted with the surplus products of the European manufacturers, it would have a very disastrous effect on the business and capital invested in these plants; particularly so when England has shut off any possibility of competition in the British Isles and her colonies, and Germany by high tariff.

We feel that we have a right to request simply a retention of the present duties on these materials, for the purpose of conserving to this country the manufacture and sale of products, for which, as above stated, this country is already oversupplied at the present time with producing capacity, with consequent low prices to the consumers, due to competitive conditions.

The foreign plants manufacturing these materials are located principally in Germany and England, there being but 3 plants in France, as against 8 in Germany, 10 in England and Scotland, and 3 in Belgium. Thus it will be seen that the greater majority of the foreign manufacturers are protected from importations from this country, or practically so, and if these duties were reduced they could send their surplus products here with practically no chance of retaliation by the home manufacturers.

If competition is a desirable thing to bring about, it certainly should be reciprocal, and a one-sided competition, where the American manufacturers have no chance to get into the foreign markets on account of the facts above stated, certainly ought not to be desired. Moreover, as stated, these products are already selling in this country, due to local competition, for considerably less than these same products sell in the foreign markets, and naturally the foreign manufacturer does not desire to reduce the price in this country any lower than prevailing prices, because he can sell his products already for a higher price at home, and he would only avail himself of our markets with his surplus product or when there was a dullness in his home markets.

Here we have a case, therefore, of an American industry in which a very reasonable amount of capital is already invested and one in which the business has been created in various parts of the country by the ingenuity and ability of our people, and a large number of our citizens obtain employment and a livelihood; where, if any material changes are made in the tariffs, it would probably result in the partial destruction, if not the very serious impairment, of the entire business.

For these reasons it is earnestly asked that no change be made in the duties on these specific items.

The facts above stated can and will be verified by the testimony of competent witnesses, if desired, and witnesses thoroughly familiar with this business in all its details; the particular facts stated being taken from information furnished the undersigned by one of the leading experts in the business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

145. Aluminum, aluminum scrap, and alloys of any kind in which aluminum is the component material of chief value, in crude form, aluminum in plates, sheets, bars, and rods; barium, calcium, magnesium, sodium, and potassium, and alloys of which said metals are the component material of chief value, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 39, line 6, by striking out "25 per cent ad valorem" and inserting in lieu thereof "7 cents per pound."

Mr. AUSTIN. I wish to debate that amendment after recess.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill—and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. STEDMAN, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for 10 days, on account of illness in family.

REPORT ON CONCENTRATION OF CONTROL OF MONEY AND CREDIT.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 1, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 1.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed 6,000 additional copies of House Report No. 1593, Sixty-second Congress, on the "Concentration of Control of Money and Credit," of which 2,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate document room and 4,000 copies for the use of the House document room.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, how much is there to this report?

Mr. FINLEY. Well, the Senate concurrent resolution provides for the printing of 6,000 additional copies.

Mr. MANN. Does this report contain all the evidence?

Mr. FINLEY. It does.

Mr. MANN. How much is there of it?

Mr. FINLEY. The cost will be \$1,003.80.

Mr. MANN. How much of a volume is it or how many volumes are there?

Mr. FINLEY. I will tell the gentleman frankly that it came over only a little while ago, and I have not had time to investigate that.

Mr. MANN. If it is a valuable report, some of the gentlemen now on the floor will know how long a report it is. I am frank to say I have not read it. It is not a book of that size if it contains all the evidence taken.

Mr. FINLEY. That work is still under way, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will permit me.

Mr. HARDWICK. If the gentleman from South Carolina will permit, I will say that I have heard they took three or four thousand pages of testimony. I can not vouch for the accuracy of that. It will probably be three or four volumes.

Mr. MANN. I was trying to ascertain whether all the testimony that was taken was to be included in this report. We had the privilege of reprinting in large numbers all the testimony that was taken. So far as printing the report is concerned, we never object to things of that kind.

Mr. HARDWICK. We could not print all that evidence in a report for \$1,000.

Mr. MANN. Probably not.

Mr. FINLEY. This will cost within a fraction of \$1,000—a little over \$1,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR EVENING SESSION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair assigns the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. REILLY] to preside as Speaker pro tempore to-night.

RECESS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now take a recess until 7.45 p. m.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 7.45 p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

At 7.45 p. m., the recess having expired, Mr. REILLY of Connecticut, Speaker pro tempore, called the House to order.

LABORERS AND JANITORS.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present the following privileged report from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] offers a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 56 (H. Rept. 8).

Resolved, That the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint three laborers and three janitors, who shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, compensation at the rate of \$60 per month; and also a stenographer to the Journal clerk, who shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, compensation at the rate of \$1,000 per annum.

With committee amendments, as follows:

Amend line 2 by striking out the word "three" after the word "appoint" and inserting the word "four" in lieu thereof, and in the same line, after the word "and," strike out the word "three" and insert the word "two."

Mr. LLOYD. There is another amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the other amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Also, amend, by striking out all of the resolution after the word "month," in line 4.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the resolution reported as it would be if the amendments are agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution as it would read if amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint four laborers and two janitors, who shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, compensation at the rate of \$60 per month.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman if these are to be session employees or permanent employees?

Mr. LLOYD. Session employees.

Mr. MANN. The resolution does not so state.

Mr. LLOYD. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. These are to be permanent employees.

Mr. MANN. And the stenographer?

Mr. LLOYD. That is not provided for. That is taken out by the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Why was that taken out, may I ask?

Mr. LLOYD. That was taken out because the Journal clerk and the bill clerk concluded that they could get along without the additional stenographer during this session of Congress. We may ask for it at the next session of Congress if it is needed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the Journal clerk of the House is new, and thus far probably has not had any very great difficulty in handling the Journal of the House. I think myself that ordinarily the Journal clerk ought to have a stenographer.

Mr. LLOYD. The Journal clerk and the bill clerk have conferred, and by arrangement between them the Journal clerk has the present stenographer the greater part of the time.

Mr. MANN. I am not violating any confidence now when I say that I feel very certain from what was said to me in a former Congress that that arrangement was not very satisfactory to the former Journal clerk.

Mr. LLOYD. I may say that it is satisfactory to the present Journal clerk. These officers are kind enough to try to get along without this additional stenographer if they can, and if they do so this additional one will not be needed.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire what particular work these laborers are doing?

Mr. LLOYD. The janitors are expected to care for all the offices of the Clerk; that is, the Clerk's office proper, and the office of the Chief Clerk, and the office of the disbursing clerk, the bill clerk's office, and the Journal clerk's office. There are 16 rooms in all that they are expected to take care of.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is doing this work now?

Mr. LLOYD. There is a messenger who is doing janitor service, and part of the time the Clerk pays for having this work done out of his own pocket.

Mr. FOSTER. Has this messenger been doing janitor work and taking care of 16 rooms thus far during all this Congress?

Mr. LLOYD. He has done part of that work a part of the time, and the Doorkeeper has furnished help a part of the time, and at other times the Clerk has been obliged to employ help himself.

Mr. FOSTER. In order to keep these rooms clean?

Mr. LLOYD. To keep these rooms in order, yes.

Mr. FOSTER. At the beginning of the Sixty-first Congress were these laborers discharged, or is this an additional force to what was on in the Sixty-first Congress.

Mr. LLOYD. Nearly all the Clerk's force was cut off at that time. In the Sixty-first Congress they had plenty of messengers, janitors, and additional clerks, and the force was cut just about half at the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. FOSTER. Who is taking care of the rooms of these committees for which the janitors and messengers were appointed last year?

Mr. LLOYD. These men are not taking care of any rooms that are now occupied by Members of Congress. There is another resolution that will provide for that. In the last Congress we had two janitors to take care of the rooms in this building that are occupied by Members of Congress.

Mr. FOSTER. It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that if these men have been able to do this work in the last two years, I do not understand why it is necessary to have additional men at this time.

Mr. LLOYD. There is additional service, too, that is needed, that was not rendered in the last Congress but that was rendered in previous Congresses. There ought to be some messenger provided to deliver the bills from the document room to the various chairmen of committees who have no janitors immediately upon the receipt of the bills.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman think that for \$60 a month we can supply a person to do that sort of work?

Mr. LLOYD. The Clerk advises us that he can. I do not know whether he can or not.

Mr. PALMER. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman will find that the chairmen of committees send

their own clerks and messengers to the document room for bills. That is a universal practice, and we cut that place out purposely because the committees did send their own clerks and janitors after bills.

Mr. LLOYD. It is also true that the Clerk has no messenger to send to the Journal clerk's room, the enrolling clerk's room, the disbursing clerk's room, or to send over to the stationery room. He needs a messenger to send to these various places. He insists that he ought to have a messenger at the stationery room. There is no one there to receive or deliver stationery. There are just the two men in that room. We took out of the stationery room, and very properly, I think, all the help which had formerly been provided there except the stationery clerk and the assistant.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, with the bills going to the Clerk's room after being introduced and referred to the committees, I do not believe it is necessary to have a messenger to carry those bills around. All of the great committees have clerks and messengers, and they can go to the document room after bills.

Mr. LLOYD. If the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. FOSTER. Just a moment.

Mr. LLOYD. I want to explain just at this point.

Mr. FOSTER. All these larger committees which have a great many bills referred to them, like the Judiciary, Pension, and Post Office Committees, and other committees of that class, have janitors or messengers who can get these bills without much trouble when the clerks are busy; but it seems to me that in the case of these minor committees their clerks are not so busy but that they are able to go and get these bills without the expense of hiring some one to carry them around to them.

Mr. MANN. Will my colleague yield for a suggestion?

Mr. LLOYD. There are nearly 20 committees that have no janitors. It is not necessary to furnish bills to the Appropriations Committee, or the Ways and Means Committee, or any of the large committees that have janitors.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that, but as far as I am concerned I should object to the employment of an additional person to deliver these bills around to these committees.

Mr. LLOYD. These messengers are not to be assigned to any particular duty. They are placed under the control of the Clerk, and he is to use them wherever they are necessary. The Clerk insists that he needs this additional force to do the messenger and janitor service in his department.

Mr. FOSTER. I understood from the gentleman from Missouri that one of these men was to be assigned to that duty.

Mr. LLOYD. No; I beg your pardon. There is no assignment to any particular place.

Mr. FOSTER. That the intention was to use one of these men for this purpose.

Mr. LLOYD. As I understood, you asked what these men were expected to do, and one of the things that one of them was expected to do was to deliver bills to the committees that have no janitors.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman what is the process now by which the Senate bills are delivered to the committees?

Mr. LLOYD. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. FOSTER. I think Senate bills are referred to the Clerk's room just as House bills. They go there and get them.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether that is the way; I think it is a haphazard way. Formerly there was a clerk whose business it was to deliver the bills, to deliver Senate bills, taking the receipt in each case out of a book of the chairman of the committee. In the last Congress several times Senate bills were lost. I have no doubt they were lost because that method was no longer pursued.

Mr. PALMER. And in former Congresses also.

Mr. FOSTER. Receipts are taken for all bills now just as they were in former Congresses.

Mr. MANN. I do not know what the process is now. Nobody seemed to be able to locate some bills in the last Congress, and I supposed they were lost in that manner.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question. What is the necessity of a bill-distributing messenger?

Mr. LLOYD. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have not stated that there would be any messenger assigned to distribute bills. He is a messenger to perform any and all duties that are to be performed in any way.

Mr. COX. I do not think there is any necessity for a messenger of that kind at all, and I will state why. My little committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, has bills sent to it by mail by the Clerk, and also copies of all bills that I have introduced. I have no complaint on

earth to make about it. Every bill introduced here I presume reaches its final and proper destination. The Clerk of the House furnishes me with a copy of all bills going to my committee. I have on file in my office a copy of every bill introduced by any Member referred to my committee, and also a copy of every bill I have introduced going to any other committee. Here is what I am afraid of, with all due deference to the chairman of the Committee on Accounts. We cut out a lot of jobs two years ago, and criticized gentlemen on the other side for their practice of having extra employees for four or five years.

Mr. MANN. You know more now.

Mr. COX. We had a lot of useless employees that we cut out. And I am wondering in my mind whether there is an attempt here to get some of these employees back.

Mr. LLOYD. I can assure the gentleman most positively that there is no attempt to get employees back. There is nothing of that kind.

Mr. COX. These are new employees.

Mr. LLOYD. They are new; but they are not such employees as were in the office before. The men in the Clerk's department received \$1,500, \$1,800, and \$2,250 a year. We are providing for messenger service that is necessary to be performed under this resolution at the rate of \$60 a month. Another thing: You must take into consideration that there is additional work for the clerks to perform. Instead of having 392 Members we have now 435 Members, and that makes additional work for the Clerk to take care of in the accounts of all these Members. It does not occur right now.

Mr. COX. I think the gentleman does not attach much importance to the increase of membership.

Mr. LLOYD. The Clerk says it will make an additional burden.

Mr. COX. I can not concur in that statement. I do not think so.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says this resolution does not put back any employees who were cut out in the resolution that was passed in the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress. I call his attention to the fact that one of the employees who was theretofore carried on the rolls was a messenger in the Clerk's office, whose sole duty it was to carry bills from the document room to the various committees when referred.

Mr. LLOYD. And he received a salary of \$2,250 for performing that duty.

Mr. MANN. And he earned it.

Mr. PALMER. The fact is that the employee did little or nothing, because the committees sent for the bills themselves and the Members got all of their own bills.

That was on the theory that every bill that is worthy of consideration by a committee will have a Member behind it who will see that the committee gets it, so that place was cut out; and I hope the gentleman from Missouri will not in a small House suggest that we shall to-night attempt to put back on the rolls of the House any official who was cut out after careful investigation and full consideration by a practically unanimous sentiment of the majority Members of this House in the Sixty-second Congress.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised at the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who himself offered in the last House a resolution which would have restored \$22,500 in salaries.

Mr. PALMER. I did that at the beginning of the Congress, with the statement that as to those particular places we had some doubt, and we wanted to be perfectly fair. We did not press the resolution, because in the Sixty-second Congress we thought that the House organization, as we had framed it up, was amply competent to take care of the business of the House, and the gentleman knows that we did not press that resolution. This is not big enough to fight seriously about, and I think the gentleman ought to go slowly in the matter.

Mr. LLOYD. It is big enough that the Clerk of the House should have the service he needs to perform the duties of his office, and he insists that he wants this additional assistance. Now, with reference to the notification clerk, we are not restoring him. There is no attempt to restore the notification clerk. We have not a messenger who is to distribute these bills. It may be that the individual chairmen of these committees would rather have them mailed and get them later in the day—

Mr. COX. I did not say that; I simply had no complaint to make of—

Mr. LLOYD. If they have a messenger that will settle it at once.

Mr. MADDEN. If I may be allowed to interject a word, if there is any trouble about the distribution of these places you can send them over here.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, just one word and I am through. I think if the gentleman from Missouri is providing by this for people to take care of these rooms—janitors, which are necessary—as far as I am concerned, I shall have no objection; but I do think the gentleman from Missouri ought not to bring in here, as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a provision for any help for the employment of this notification or bill clerk, as you may call it, to mail bills around, and if there is one person now performing that service I shall object at this time.

Mr. LLOYD. The Committee on Accounts has carefully investigated this resolution, and it is a unanimous report of that committee. I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution as amended.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. FOSTER) there were—ayes 52, noes 9.

So the resolution as amended was agreed to.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 55 (H. Rept. 7).

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint two janitors for committees, located in the Capitol, during the sessions of the Sixty-third Congress, compensation at the rate of \$60 per month for each janitor to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, said appointments to begin the 1st of April, 1913.

Mr. MANN. I understood that the other resolution carried two janitors.

Mr. LLOYD. The other provided janitors for the Clerk. This provides janitors for the various committees, including Mr. Cox's committee, Mr. HAMLIN's, and various committees over this building where they have no janitor.

Mr. MANN. Does the Clerk need two new janitors?

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, these janitors have nothing whatever to do with the Clerk, and the Clerk has nothing to do with them. These two janitors take care of 8 or 10 rooms.

Mr. COX. We have janitor service now.

Mr. LLOYD. Certainly; and that is what we want to provide pay for, and what we are seeking to do is to provide for the janitors that the gentleman has now.

Mr. COX. Are the janitors now doing janitor work—the same men that worked last year?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, it can not be possible that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] wants a janitor. I supposed, with his economic turn of mind, that he took care of his own room.

Mr. COX. No. The only thing that I know about that is that a janitor comes in every morning and cleans up. I was inquiring whether that was a new position.

Mr. LLOYD. We are providing for these janitors and not providing any new assignments whatever.

Mr. HARDWICK. In other words, we are giving the Members with committee rooms the same service that they get in the Office Building.

Mr. LLOYD. Exactly so.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, if necessary, I would ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana be permitted to take care of his own room, so as to get rid of the janitor. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ATTENDANT, LADIES' RECEPTION ROOM.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 54 (H. Rept. 10).

Resolved, That the Doorkeeper of the House be, and is hereby, authorized to appoint an attendant for the ladies' reception room of the House during the sessions of the Sixty-third Congress, compensation at the rate of \$75 per month to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. MANN. Is this the usual rate of compensation?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Seventy-five a month?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes; just the same as a page.

Mr. HARDWICK. The same old thing in the same old way.

Mr. LLOYD. The same person and the same pay as last session and the preceding session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

MARY S. MANN.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 61 (H. Rept. 9).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized to pay, out of the contingent fund, to Mary S. Mann, widow of Charles H. Mann, late superintendent of the reporters' gallery of the House, a sum equal to six months of his salary as such employee and an additional amount, not exceeding \$250, for the funeral expenses of said Charles H. Mann.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3321—the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the tariff bill, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], and, without objection, the amendment will be again reported.

There was no objection, and the amendment was again reported.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to continue the present duty on aluminum. There are two aluminum companies in the United States—the Aluminum Co. of America and the Southern Aluminum Co., the latter a new company, being in the South and at this time having in course of erection its plant in North Carolina. Aluminum is made from bauxite, and that ore is found only in the South. It is located in the districts represented by Mr. LEE, of Georgia, Mr. MOON, of Tennessee, Mr. BURNETT, of Alabama, and Mr. TAYLOR, of Arkansas.

We are now producing in this country 45,000,000 pounds of aluminum per annum, and we are importing from France and other countries 12,500,000 pounds per annum. If the provision now placed in the Underwood bill becomes a law, we will increase our importations in value from \$1,857,000 to \$2,500,000, making an increase in importation over and above the present importation of \$643,000.

The cost of producing aluminum in the way of labor amounts to 60 per cent of the cost of production. Sixty per cent of \$643,000 is \$385,800 in labor. In other words, we increase our importation of aluminum and we deprive American wage earners of \$385,800 per annum that they are now receiving. In four years we would take from these wage earners engaged in this industry \$1,543,000. Our present duty on aluminum is 7 cents per pound, and to show you that it is low enough, the figures of the Treasury Department show that the French and other makers of aluminum have been able to ship into this country and successfully sell in competition with the aluminum made in America 12,500,000 pounds per annum.

Our greatest competitor in the production of aluminum is France, which produces annually 40,000,000 pounds. They use 6,000,000 pounds, and have a surplus of 34,000,000 pounds to sell to other countries. There is a duty of 7½ cents a pound on every pound of aluminum imported into France and sold in competition with aluminum made in that country. The average wage per day in the aluminum plants of our competitors abroad is 80 cents as compared with \$2.50 a day in this country. Now, is it for the best interests of America, will it advance and promote the interests of the four States in the South that have the only known deposits of bauxite in this country out of which aluminum is made, to reduce our duty to practically 2½ cents per pound and permit the French people, with a surplus of 34,000,000 pounds a year to enter this field in competition with aluminum made from southern bauxite?

Oh, I know the gentleman who has charge of this bill [Mr. PALMER] will say that the Aluminum Co. of America is a

monopoly in this country. Yes; and I say to him that there is a legalized pool and an Aluminum Trust in France and in the other foreign countries where our competitors are engaged in this business. If there is a pool or a monopoly there why should not the American Congress prefer an American monopoly or an American trust, which voluntarily reduced the price of aluminum from \$8 per pound to 17 cents per pound, in preference to a foreign trust or a foreign monopoly? Why should we seek by legislation to take business from the aluminum mills of America and money from the wage earners in the American aluminum plants? Why should we attempt by legislation to take in round numbers over a million and a half dollars per annum and turn it over to foreigners, to plants operated in Europe that pay no taxes to the American Government or any State in it, or who do not employ a single American wage earner?

I submit for the consideration of this House an appeal from the business organizations of Knoxville, Tenn., in the interest of this great American industry.

The appeal is as follows:

Resolution adopted at a special joint session of the boards of directors of the Board of Commerce, Commercial Club, Manufacturers and Producers' Association, and Traffic Bureau, of Knoxville, Tenn.

Whereas the aluminum industry of the United States, being fostered and stimulated by patents on the process of manufacture and by a duty of 7 cents per pound on foreign aluminum, has during the last 20 years grown from practically nothing to an output of 40,000,000 pounds per annum, while the price to the consumer has fallen from \$4 per pound to 18 cents per pound; and

Whereas said patents have now expired, leaving nothing but the tariff of 7 cents per pound to secure to the American manufacturer the home market; and

Whereas it is far more expensive to produce aluminum in this country than in France and other foreign countries because of the fact that foreign bauxite is richer than that found in America, and because in foreign countries bauxite, coal deposits, and water power for generating electricity are found in close proximity to each other, while in this country they are found far apart; and because it is far more costly to develop the water powers in this than in foreign countries and because the American manufacturer must pay much higher wages to labor than his foreign competitor; and

Whereas there are thousands of American citizens dependent upon the aluminum industries for support and millions of American capital invested in the business, both of which would suffer if the American market should be turned over to the foreign producer of aluminum; and

Whereas bauxite, from which aluminum is made, is found only in the Southern States, and there are also found in the South vast coal deposits and undeveloped water power possibilities, both of which are essential in the production of aluminum; and

Whereas these advantages have attracted the manufacturers of aluminum in this country and abroad to such an extent that the Aluminum Co. of America and the Southern Aluminum Co. have each recently secured extensive water powers in the South with a view to their immediate development for use in the manufacture of aluminum, which development would, in the opinion of this body, be retarded and delayed, if not entirely prevented by any tariff legislation which would make it easier for foreign producers to sell their goods in this market and harder for the American manufacturer to obtain reasonable returns on the capital invested in the aluminum business; and

Whereas we believe that there is no demand coming from the consumers of aluminum goods for a lower duty, but that the cry for a lower tariff on aluminum comes solely from the manufacturers in their own interest and is not made in the interest of the consumers: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Board of Commerce, Commercial Club, Manufacturers' and Producers' Association, and Traffic Bureau, of Knoxville, Tenn., That we deem it prejudicial to the best interest of the South to reduce the tariff on aluminum below 7 cents per pound, and we therefore urge our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence to prevent such reduction.

J. W. BROWNLEE,

President Board of Commerce, Knoxville, Tenn.

G. E. BRADFORD,

President Commercial Club, Knoxville, Tenn.

W. A. MOERLY,

President Manufacturers' and Producers' Association, Knoxville, Tenn.

JESSE THOMAS,

President Traffic Bureau, Knoxville, Tenn.

CHAS. KIMMICK,

Secretary Joint Meeting.

KNOXVILLE, TENN., February 6, 1913.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, if there is any rate in all the length and breadth of this bill which is entirely and absolutely justified by the facts, it is this rate on aluminum, which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] would seek to change. The fact is that his constituents, the interests for whom he is speaking here in this matter, do not care particularly about this tariff rate upon aluminum. The gentleman applies his remarks to the aluminum paragraph, but what he has back in his head is what the Aluminum Co. of America has in its mind—the fact that we have put bauxite, the raw material of the Aluminum Co. of America, on the free list. That is what is frightening them, and for a very peculiar and interesting reason. The gentleman from Tennessee talks about the compe-

tition that the Aluminum Co. of America is suffering now and is liable to suffer because of this decreased rate. There is not a particle of competition in the aluminum business in this country or anywhere else on God's earth. There is an absolutely country-wide monopoly in America possessed by the Aluminum Co. of America, and, as the gentleman says, there is a trust abroad as well, and the Aluminum Co. of America is the founder of that trust and the biggest part of it.

Mr. Davis, the general manager of the Aluminum Co. of America, testified before the Ways and Means Committee in January that he went to London and wrote the agreement on behalf of his Canadian company, owned by the Aluminum Co. of America, which fixed the price and divided the market all over the world for aluminum. Now, the only reason we left a rate upon this aluminum at all was because the Aluminum Co. of America is not big enough, giant though it has become, it has not secured a sufficient number of water powers which are necessary for the manufacture of aluminum, to entirely supply the American market, and it must permit its foreign associates, companies associated with it under the agreement that Mr. Davis wrote, to send into this country something like \$1,800,000 worth of aluminum per annum. Upon that aluminum we levy this tax of 25 per cent in order to raise revenue for the Government.

It is not to give the Aluminum Co. of America competition, because there is no competition. The price is world-wide, and in this country larger than the foreign country by the amount of duty, making an even level of price the world over. The gentleman refers to another aluminum company as if the trust really did have some opposition and competition in this country. It is not so. But some venturesome Frenchmen have come over into this country and have undertaken to build an aluminum plant down in one of the Carolinas.

They have invested a large amount of money, although they have not got to the point of making any aluminum itself. The Aluminum Co. of America, the American Aluminum Trust, owns all the commercial bauxite in America, most of which is located down in the section of country represented by my friend from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

Mr. AUSTIN. There is none of it in my district.

Mr. PALMER. Well, in that section; and with the Aluminum Trust's grip on bauxite, these Frenchmen can not give them any competition unless we put bauxite on the free list; so that we are getting revenue upon this item by putting a 25 per cent rate on aluminum, and getting 25 per cent of the nearly \$2,000,000 worth of aluminum which will come into the country, and we are making it possible for this world-wide trust to have actual competition by depriving it of its monopoly in the ownership of the bauxite beds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 39, line 3, by inserting after the word "bars" the word "strips."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

146. Antimony, as regulus or metal, antimony ore, stibnite and matte containing antimony but not containing more than 10 per cent of lead, 10 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That on all importations of antimony-bearing ores and matte containing antimony the duties shall be estimated at the port of entry, and a bond given in double the amount of such estimated duties for the transportation of the ores by common carriers bonded for the transportation of appraised or unappraised merchandise to properly equipped sampling or smelting establishments, whether designated as bonded warehouses or otherwise. On the arrival of the ores at such establishments, they shall be sampled according to commercial methods under the supervision of Government officers, who shall be stationed at such establishments, and who shall submit the samples thus obtained to a Government assayer, designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall make a proper assay of the sample and report the result to the proper customs officers, and the import entry shall be liquidated thereon, except in case of ores that shall be removed to a bonded warehouse to be refined for exportation as provided by law, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make all necessary regulations to enforce the provisions of this paragraph; antimony, oxide salts, and compounds of, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, in paragraph 146 I move to strike out the last word. It relates to the duty on antimony.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the last word in paragraph 146.

Mr. MANN. I call the attention of the Members to this letter: *

INTERNATIONAL NAIL CORPORATION,

Chicago, January 9, 1913.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MANN:

As you are aware, some time ago you procured for me statistics on antimony, which were very valuable to me at the time, and on the strength of that knowledge I formed, with a number of my friends, a corporation several years ago for the smelting of antimony, and only now, after spending in the neighborhood of \$120,000, we are very close to smelting.

I can intelligently say that the reason that there has been no antimony smelted in this country for several years last past is because of the cheapness of the production of antimony and the oxide from the other side, accompanied with a very low duty, such as the regulus, carrying 1½ cents a pound duty, and the oxide of antimony, carrying 1½ cents a pound with an additional 25 per cent a pound ad valorem; and stibnite and matte, containing antimony and not containing more than 10 per cent of lead, 1 cent a pound on antimony contained therein. That, you will see, is so low that it is pretty nearly prohibitive for the American public in the West where these mines are for them to go ahead and mine and smelt this antimony.

My visit through the West several months ago caused me to call through the extreme south of California and up to the extreme northwest of Washington, stopping at all the known places where antimony has been mined and can be, and I can truthfully say that there is an awful pile of it, but the same old howl is there. We would be pleased to mine and smelt, but the duty is too low for us to compete with the foreign business, as far as the price of antimony itself is concerned.

As this antimony proposition has taken five years of hard labor to put it where it is, as far as I am concerned and all the money that I could get myself and the friends that I have interested in with me, I feel as though I ought to communicate with you in time and place the matter before you as I have, and am satisfied that you will do what a lot of other people could not for me. If that duty can not be raised, for "the love of Mike" let it stand as it is.

I would be pleased to hear from you regarding your ideas in this matter, and if you found it essential for me to be in Washington before this explosion takes place kindly advise me, and I will be pleased to come, as we can not afford to fail in this effort.

Yours, as ever,

FRANK NOWAT.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MILLER. I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] a question. It is this: What is antimony used for in the arts?

Mr. PALMER. It is used in the manufacture of type metal, Babbitt metal, for ball bearings, and so forth.

Mr. MILLER. Is there any such monopoly with respect to that metal as there is with respect to aluminum?

Mr. PALMER. Not that I know of.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that, in view of his statement regarding the Aluminum Trust in the United States and abroad being practically controlled by the same parties, it was thought wise to put a duty on the importations of aluminum, the local monopoly not being able to supply the local demand, so that a tax on the importations is simply a tax on the trust.

Mr. PALMER. Yes; the last reason being the controlling reason. The fact that they are not able to supply the local demand makes it necessary to let importations come in, and we get the revenue.

Mr. MILLER. As I understand, the amount of the duty will be simply that much taken from the trust for revenue for the benefit of the United States Government.

Mr. PALMER. That is it.

Mr. MILLER. Would not the gentleman think it wise to retain that duty at 50 per cent instead of dropping it down to 25 per cent if the total amount is to be collected from the trust anyhow? I notice from the tables that have been prepared that the expected importations will cause a slight reduction in the amount of the revenues to be derived from aluminum and a slight reduction in the amount of the revenues to be derived from antimony. For instance, of one form of antimony there was received in the year 1912, in round numbers, \$74,000, and it is expected that \$50,000 only a year will be received under this bill. On another antimony item \$148,000 was received in 1910. Now it is expected to receive under this bill \$80,000. On another item \$27,000 was received and it is expected to receive \$20,000, and so on down through the list. Especially is this falling off of revenue to be found in the aluminum paragraph. In 1912 we received in duties on aluminum products \$1,047,000, and it is estimated by the committee that we will now receive under this bill only \$625,000. It seems to me that if the amount to be collected in duties on aluminum is to be simply a tax upon the trusts, it might be wise to make

that tax as high as possible. This bill appears to fatten the Aluminum Trust to the extent of \$400,000 each year.

Mr. PALMER. I would be glad to do that if it were not for the fact that, of course, a certain proportion of the tax can be, and is, passed on in the price of the article which is made by the Aluminum Co. of America. While there is this world-wide agreement, it is maintained with due regard for tariff duties. The price of aluminum in this country is to-day 7 cents higher than the foreign price, or it was until recently. That is to say, the duty is added to the foreign price to make the American price; and I would not be willing to write into this law such a rate as would continue the possibility of the Aluminum Co. of America adding as much as 7 cents a pound to its crude prices, or 11 cents a pound to its finished aluminum, at the expense of the consumer.

Mr. MILLER. Then the gentleman does think there exists some relationship between the amount of duty collected and the cost to the consumer of the finished product.

Mr. PALMER. I have many times said, and everybody else has said, that the consumer pays the tax.

Mr. MILLER. I understood from the gentleman's statement that the trusts were paying this tax.

Mr. PALMER. It comes out of the trusts primarily, of course, into the Government coffers.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the price of imported aluminum is shown by the report of the committee to have been 24 cents a pound in 1905, and 12 cents a pound in 1912. That shows a very amiable disposition on the part of the Aluminum Trust, I take it, that with the tariff duties stated as 7 cents a pound during all this period, they now charge only 50 per cent, practically, of the price which they charged seven years ago on imported aluminum.

Mr. PALMER. The fact is that even under the falling prices which the Aluminum Co. of America have maintained—because they were the sole dictators as to what the price should be—their profits were so enormous that they would have been afraid to maintain any higher price to increase those enormous profits.

Mr. MANN. But if this is a world-wide trust, without any competition, I should say that it indicated a rather generous disposition on the part of that monopoly in this case. In the course of seven years it has cut the price 50 per cent.

Mr. PALMER. It was not generosity or philanthropy which prompted that. It was the fear that if out of a common article of necessity of this kind they continued to make such enormous profits as they made some years ago, they would so incense the public mind that attention would be drawn to their unconscionable activities, and as a trust they would be wiped out of existence.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that aluminum was selling in this country for \$80 a ton, and they were the sole people who owned or controlled it. They have put the price down from \$80 a ton to 17 cents a pound.

Mr. MANN. That is, under the influence of a protective tariff the price was cut in two in the course of seven years.

Mr. AUSTIN. The protective tariff enabled them to develop the industry.

Mr. PALMER. The price of aluminum has come down on account of the inventions, improvements, and discoveries which have been made in the methods of its manufacture and the uses to which it can be put, but to which it was never put when aluminum was \$80 a ton. At that time it was not a commercial article at all.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is it not a fact that the American Aluminum Co. extended the use of aluminum, built up this business from the very start, and that it has very greatly reduced the price from that day up to this?

Mr. PALMER. That is a fact.

Mr. AUSTIN. Give them credit for it!

Mr. PALMER. I give them credit for it. It is a fact also that on an actual investment of something less than \$2,000,000 they are to-day declaring dividends upon their stock, which amount to nearly 200 per cent on all the money they have invested as original investment, and with the present comparatively low price of aluminum they are making enormous profits. They are entitled to credit for their success, but their large profits show that the reduction in aluminum to American consumers resulting from this decrease can come from their profits without undue injury to the industry.

Mr. PAYNE. Is it not true that no aluminum was produced in the United States practically until we put a protective tariff upon it?

Mr. PALMER. I do not think that had anything to do with its production here.

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly not, according to the gentleman's idea. These gentlemen came here and asked for a tariff on it in order that they might go into the enterprise. They did go into the enterprise, and they have reduced the price steadily from that time to this, and they have built up the industry.

Mr. PALMER. The business has been built up largely, as stated before, because of the control of the one concern of the patent on the discoveries connected with the methods by which it was made. The largest reason why the price has gone down, besides the fear of prosecution of this trust if the enormous profits continued, was the fear of competition on American soil.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, it is true they were protected by patents as well as by the duty in the first place, but they did not make any and did not get any patent on the invention or invent any new process until the protective tariff was put on the article. Then they went to work and invented a new process and took out patents under the laws which we all believe in, and they were protected in that as well as the tariff.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman claims that the protective tariff stimulated invention?

Mr. PAYNE. Certainly it does set them to work and gives them a chance. I wish the gentleman from Pennsylvania would get that into his head, and the more he studies it the more he will appreciate it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not see why this company should fear local competition, because the gentleman from Pennsylvania has stated that this company owns an absolute monopoly of all the raw materials.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk read as follows:

148. Bronze powder, brocades, flitters, and metallics; bronze, or Dutch-metal or aluminum, in leaf, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, to ask a couple of questions. What did the committee find in regard to bronze powder as a reason for changing the tariff to 25 per cent ad valorem, practically a reduction of about 20 per cent?

Mr. PALMER. I will say to the gentleman from Connecticut that bronze-powder manufacturers came to Washington protesting vigorously against this reduction. They saw me in conference and told me the prices they were paying for labor in this country and the prices they were paying abroad; and after we had gone all over it with them it developed that this rate exactly equalized the difference in their cost of production, according to their own statement. We did not think, on any theory, they made much of a case for us to raise it.

Mr. DONOVAN. Has the gentleman got the figures of the total amount of business in bronze powder? The point I want to make is that about one-half of the bronze powder was imported under the Payne tariff law, and by the reduction of this duty it will practically allow all the bronze powder business for the other side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Is not that all right? Did not the gentleman from Connecticut vote for that?

Mr. DONOVAN. I want to know if the gentleman's figures show that one-half of the bronze powder was imported under the Payne law?

Mr. PALMER. I have not the figures at hand, and if that was so it would not scare me any.

Mr. DONOVAN. I was not familiar with the situation, but I supposed the committee had treated this in an intelligent manner.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PALMER. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I notice in this paragraph the committee has proposed to reduce the tariff rates on flitters. Does the term "flitters" refer to the gentlemen on the other side of the House who will be out of it after the tariff goes into effect? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

150. Gold leaf, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the paragraph and insert in lieu the following:

"150. Gold leaf, 35 cents per 100 leaves. The foregoing rate applies to leaf not exceeding in size the equivalent of 3½ by 3½ inches; additional duties in the same proportion shall be assessed on leaf exceeding in size said equivalent."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, it may be conceded at the outset that gold leaf is not eaten by the poor. Ordinarily it is in the luxury class, but the rate of duty has been reduced in this bill. The amendment I have offered attempts to restore the rate to what it was under the act of 1909. The amendment is offered at the suggestion of both the employers and the employees, numbering about 3,000 in this country, whose business and employment is affected by the proposed reduction.

In support of their contention, I desire to present this extract from a statement prepared by both sides, employers and employees:

The wages are \$12 to \$15 per week for men and \$5 to \$7 for women, and any change in duty, however small, would of necessity be taken off the present wages, as Germany now lays down gold leaf in this country at less than the cost price even at these wages, already low as compared with other skilled trades. The German wages are \$6 to \$7.50 for men and \$3 to \$5 for women, being 50 per cent less than American wages. In Germany each man works with several apprentices; the net result is greatly in excess of 50 per cent less than in this country.

I desire to say this change is evidently not in the interest of revenue, because it is an advance of only 5 per cent over the Wilson bill rate. The Wilson tariff of 1896 collected only \$766 of duties upon gold leaf. Under the Payne act, where the ad valorem equivalent is 37.77 per cent of protection, the imports enabled the collection of duties to the extent of \$13,514 in 1912. Hence it would appear that this reduction from the Payne rate is not in the interest either of the poor, who do not eat gold leaf, nor of the Government, for which it is expected to obtain revenue.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the remark does not apply to this particular amendment of my distinguished colleague as well as to some others, but it may as well be made now. The gentleman from the Philadelphia district has been, ever since we started the consideration of this bill, bringing in amendments to restore the Payne rates, or to continue the Payne rates. He finds his mind led toward that desire so strongly that even in a case like this, where we have simply reduced the rate from 37 per cent to 35 per cent, he feels that he must put back the old Payne rate, and increase it from 35 per cent to 37 per cent. I simply want to take this occasion to call to the attention of my colleague, the gentleman from Philadelphia, the fact that every platform of every political party which was promulgated in the State of Pennsylvania in the year 1912 demanded a downward revision of the tariff. The Republican Party in Pennsylvania condemned the Payne law in its State platform and demanded a revision downward of that law.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. And it seems to me that it is about time the gentleman from Philadelphia woke up and discovered what the people in this country decided last fall. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. Just a moment. I commend to him the example of his distinguished leader, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], who knows that the American people have condemned his law because he is here with a new Schedule K, reducing his own Schedule K very materially.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMER. And I expect the gentleman from Philadelphia is opposing it.

Mr. MOORE. Can the gentleman point to a single Republican platform in State or Nation that does not declare for protection to American industries?

Mr. PALMER. I can point to the Republican platform in the State of Pennsylvania, and that is what I am talking about—the platform of the party which elected the gentleman from Philadelphia—which condemned this Payne law, and which the gentleman now seeks to restore.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman presume to say that it is not within the province of a Member to stand up for any particular industry in his district or against a great combination for which a special rate was fixed in the matter of ferromanganese?

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I will say in answer to that that if the gentleman from Philadelphia could say that he was here trying to save an industry from destruction there might be some logic in his position; but he is here because he is such a standpatter that he can not allow the rate on gold leaf to be reduced from 37 per cent to 35 per cent, and he knows that that small reduction will not have any effect upon gold-leaf manufacturers either in his district or elsewhere.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield once more?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to close all debate on this paragraph.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield once more? Is not the real difference between the gentleman from Pennsylvania and myself this, that I am standing pat against a loss of employment to men engaged in the industries, while the gentleman is sponsor for a bill which—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The gentleman from Alabama moves to close all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto. The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

155. Lead dross, lead bullion or base bullion, lead in pigs and bars, lead in any form not specially provided for in this section, old refuse lead run into blocks and bars, and old scrap lead fit only to be remanufactured; lead in sheets, pipe, shot, glaziers' lead, and lead wire; all the foregoing 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, line 23, at the end of the line insert the words "or of tinsel wire, lame, or lahn, and India rubber."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, line 24, after the word "threads," insert the words "not specially provided for."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Has this item been passed? Has paragraph 152 been passed?

Mr. PALMER. I was waiting for the Clerk to read.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion about the amendment just adopted?

Mr. PALMER. I have not taken the floor. The amendment has been offered and agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I notice everywhere else in the bill "not specially provided for in this section." While it is not important, it might be advisable to have the same language.

Mr. PALMER. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be modified by adding the words "in this section." [Applause on the Republican side.] I do that to show that the gentleman really has somebody following him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to modify the amendment last agreed to by adding the words "in this section" to the amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. PALMER. Did I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania to now move to strike out the last word which the gentleman from Illinois put in?

Mr. MOORE. No; the last word of the paragraph of the bill. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, however, which is the raw material and which is the finished product in this paragraph 152? If the gentleman from Pennsylvania would please give as much attention to the House as to the platforms of his party, perhaps he would answer my question.

Mr. PALMER. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MOORE. I want to find out what difference the committee allowed as between the raw material and the finished product in this paragraph.

Mr. PALMER. Well, there are very many different raw materials which come in at different rates.

Mr. MOORE. They are jumbled together in this paragraph. The raw material comes in at 30 per cent ad valorem and the finished product at 40 per cent ad valorem. Is not that the fact?

Mr. PALMER. Some raw material comes in at 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MOORE. But chiefly tinsel as raw material comes in at 30 per cent and the finished product at 40 per cent, so that the American manufacturer is given an actual protection of 10 per cent. Is not that the fact?

Mr. PALMER. There is a differential between wire and tinsel of 20 per cent and between tinsel and the fabric of 10 per cent.

Mr. MOORE. Does the gentleman regard these articles as luxuries?

Mr. PALMER. Some are and some are not.

Mr. MOORE. Some are Christmas ornaments and are made very cheaply in Germany in competition with the United States. The gentleman offers 10 per cent protection to the American manufacturer, whom he taxes 30 per cent for his raw material. Now, with reference to this paragraph and with particular reference to what the gentleman said a moment ago, I desire to say that the difference in political opinion between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER] and myself is this: Platforms of a party are sometimes written by an individual or a combination of individuals. Notwithstanding this the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] stands for the maintenance of industries of the United States which are progressive in an economic sense and which give employment to labor in the United States at an American wage, while the other gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], by his performance, writes out of business not only the industries of his Commonwealth, but puts out of employment men who are engaged in those industries, and this in the interest of revenue for the Government which is being collected now under the Payne bill, which he condemns.

Mr. PALMER. If the gentleman has finished his short sentence, would he mind—

Mr. MOORE. I made it as pointed as I could so that the gentleman could understand the difference between himself and myself.

Mr. PALMER. The gentleman has excused the repudiation of his party platform in Pennsylvania because of the fact that it was drawn by an individual or a combination of individuals of whom apparently he does not approve. Would the gentleman mind stating, for the information of the House and for the RECORD, in order to keep history straight in Pennsylvania, where it would be important and interesting, what individual or what combination of individuals really control the Republican Party in Pennsylvania and write its platforms? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman tell me who wrote the Government-ownership plank of the Democratic platform? Will the gentleman tell me who wrote the waterways plank in every one of the national platforms of last year? Will the gentleman tell me—

Mr. PALMER. I asked you for information.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman tell me who dictated the Democratic platform of Pennsylvania last year? I wish the gentleman would rise up and answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] has expired.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

153. Hooks and eyes, metallic, snap fasteners and clasps by whatever name known, trousers buckles and waistcoat buckles made wholly or partly of iron or steel, steel trousers buttons and metal buttons not specially provided for in this section, all the foregoing and parts thereof, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 41, strike out the last two words in line 3 and the words "buttons and metal buttons" in line 4 and insert the following: "Nickel bar buttons and trousers, buttons of steel and other metal."

Mr. CALDER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] had such good fortune in presenting an amendment to the last section of the bill, which the committee evidently overlooked, that for the same reason I have the temerity to present this. In examining the provisions affecting buttons I find that in the Payne Tariff Act they were dealt with largely in Schedule N, in paragraph 427. I have not sought to raise the duty or to interfere at all with the duty on this particular item of metal trousers buttons, but sought to put under that classification the same items that came under it in this paragraph, to which I have referred, in the Payne bill.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. You are seeking to add a new kind of metal button?

Mr. CALDER. That is right.

Mr. PALMER. And which you do not find in this bill at present?

Mr. CALDER. That is right.

Mr. PALMER. But the gentleman will note the language of the bill, "not specially provided for in this section," will cover the new metal button.

Mr. CALDER. That will leave the question open.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Oh, no; it will not. I will say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER], so that he may save time, that that particular language was written in there by a Treasury expert, who prepared the proposition. There are two items in reference to buttons in this bill. All the buttons were pulled out and put in Schedule N, except metal buttons, and this was prepared especially by an expert of the Treasury Department to cover all metal buttons, and there is no question about it.

Mr. CALDER. Those who have given the subject some thought have considered that the nickel bar buttons might be considered in Schedule N, to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman need not have any doubt, because all trousers buttons and metal buttons not specially provided for, which means all other metal buttons, are covered by this paragraph.

Mr. MANN. That would depend on whether it would be considered they were provided for under the sundries amendment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. There are none provided for under the sundries amendment. My friend from Illinois evidently has not read this paragraph or he would not ask that question.

Mr. MANN. I have read the paragraph; certainly.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It says: "Steel trousers buttons and metal buttons not specially provided for." That covers all the buttons that you could make.

Mr. MANN. It does if they are not specially provided for elsewhere.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment makes the whole thing clear, so that you do not leave open in future the question for the determination of any board of appraisers or any customs court. There is no question about it if my amendment is adopted. Otherwise there may be.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think so. If the gentleman's amendment prevailed it might cloud some other provisions as to metal buttons that are now clear.

Mr. CALDER. In the Payne Act all these buttons were in the same classification.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 41, line 1, after the word "eyes," insert the words "other than those used in the manufacture of boots and shoes."

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment, I take the position that in view of the fact that the committee that wrote this tariff bill has been kind enough to the shoe-manufacturing industry of this country to simply put the product of the shoe manufacturers on the free list and not attach any penalties to it [laughter on the Republican side], they would perhaps give sufficient consideration to that industry to allow the shoe manufacturers to receive without a duty the hooks and eyes which they use in the manufacture of shoes, which now must be sold in free and open competition with the rest of the world if this bill becomes a law.

I have been thinking that possibly the gentlemen who prepared this bill would be considerate enough to allow the shoe manufacturers to use these hooks and eyelets without being obliged to pay a duty on the same. The position assumed by the Committee on Ways and Means, as explained on this floor by the distinguished chairman of the committee, if I understand it correctly, is that the tariff duties in the future shall be levied in such a manner as to put all lines of manufacture on a competitive basis.

I have been trying to point out that this cure-all in tariff legislation is not a proper cure. It will put a premium upon dishonesty and upon the lack of thrift and the lack of economical manufacture, and will impose a penalty upon thrift, economy, and honesty. By that I mean to say this, making just this one illustration: During the debates to-day and yesterday you heard repeatedly that the duties on various articles have been placed at the point where they now appear because the importation of those articles has been either extensive or, perhaps, not extensive; and duties as high as 55 and 60 per cent have been imposed upon articles in which the labor cost is not over 75 per cent of the cost of the articles themselves.

In the shoe industry of the United States the labor cost on the average price of shoes manufactured is 25 per cent of the wholesale cost. There appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means a committee of shoe manufacturers, who pleaded with the committee earnestly, and put the proposition up to

them, and told them that this industry will suffer, and suffer severely, if the little duty of 10 per cent that was retained by the Payne bill is now removed.

It is useless to go into these details. I can not begin to think of doing it in the five minutes allotted to me. But permit me to say, Mr. Chairman, that the injustice of this thing lies in the fact that the shoe manufacturers of this country have been in open and free competition with each other, there being over 1,300 American shoe manufacturers in existence. They have been in such fierce and open competition that it has been necessary to practice the greatest economies possible in the minutest details of manufacture, and the manufacturers have succeeded in giving to the country and the people of the United States such a line of goods that, notwithstanding the fact that a duty of only 10 per cent was kept on the statute books, it has been impossible for foreign manufacturers to come in and compete. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed at the end of 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the remarks to which we have just listened from my distinguished friend, the Member from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER], furnish a striking illustration of what has been going on in this country with respect to tariff legislation under the Republican régime for many years. My friend comes here, and in the Congress of the United States, though sent here to represent 200,000 people in the great State of Pennsylvania, he makes a plea to you to put money into his own pocket; for the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania is not alone a boot and shoe manufacturer, but if I am not mistaken is the president or ex-president of the American Boot and Shoe Manufacturers' Association. Now, I ascribe to him no improper motive, but it does seem to me that it is a striking illustration of the habit of thought which has got into the minds of American manufacturers, that they can and should come here and plead with American Representatives that taxes be laid upon the American people in order to add profit to the special interests which they represent. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The gentleman speaks of this small item of hooks and eyes. I am not a shoe manufacturer, and I do not know what proportion exactly hooks and eyes bear—

Mr. KREIDER. There are 30 items which go into the manufacture of shoes which are not on the free list.

Mr. PALMER. I do not know what proportion of the value of a shoe the hooks and eyes amount to, but I am certain it is an infinitesimally small part of the value of the shoe. The gentleman's amendment would simply throw these hooks and eyes into the basket clause and increase the rate. But, passing that by, I will say to him that we did reduce this duty from 45 per cent under the present law to 15 per cent on these articles, so that, though we do have boots and shoes upon the free list, the great boot and shoe industry is not going to suffer very much by reason of the fact that it must pay simply 15 per cent upon hooks and eyes, an industry which is able to produce in this country nearly \$600,000,000 worth of product and export more of its product than any country on the face of the earth exports into foreign markets.

Mr. KREIDER. I beg to differ. The gentleman is misinformed.

Mr. PALMER. Perhaps the gentleman misunderstood me. What I say is that the American boot and shoe manufacturer exports more than any other country in the world exports.

Mr. KREIDER. The gentleman is misinformed.

Mr. PALMER. Oh! but it is absolutely true. And the boot and shoe manufacturers who came before the Ways and Means Committee confirmed that statement. The gentleman knows Mr. McElwin, I think, the head of the biggest boot and shoe manufacturing establishment in the country, and he showed that we exported, I think it was, \$17,000,000 worth of boots and shoes, against a little less than that amount exported by Great Britain, so that here is a great industry which faces a foreign competition of less than \$200,000, with a production of nearly \$600,000,000, sending its shoes all over the world, underselling the foreign manufacturer at the very door of his own factory, asking us to remit the duty of 15 per cent on hooks and eyes.

Mr. KREIDER. Will the gentleman allow me to reply?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be heard on this question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not care to go into the question of boots and shoes at this time. We will reach them later. I prefer not to debate this bill all over it.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman that debate on this paragraph has already been closed by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the committee debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto is closed. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KENNEDY] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 41, line 5, after the word "thereof," strike out "15" and insert in lieu thereof "25."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

154. Lead-bearing ores of all kinds containing more than 3 per cent of lead, one-half cent per pound on the lead contained therein: *Provided*, That on all importations of lead-bearing ores the duties shall be estimated at the port of entry, and a bond given in double the amount of such estimated duties for the transportation of the ores by common carriers bonded for the transportation of appraised or unappraised merchandise to properly equipped sampling or smelting establishments, whether designated as bonded warehouses or otherwise. On the arrival of the ores at such establishments they shall be sampled according to commercial methods under the supervision of Government officers, who shall be stationed at such establishments, and who shall submit the samples thus obtained to a Government assayer, designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall make a proper assay of the sample and report the result to the proper customs officers, and the import entries shall be liquidated thereon, except in case of ores that shall be removed to a bonded warehouse to be refined for exportation as provided by law. And the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make all necessary regulations to enforce the provisions of this paragraph.

Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, line 8, page 41, by inserting, after the word "lead," the words "one and."

[Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, in reply to what was said by my colleague in reference to the glass factories, I want to inform him that the glass factories went out of business in Oklahoma immediately after the adoption of the Payne-Aldrich bill, and the price of lead in the county went down as low as it has been for years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. Yes.

Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma. The largest glass factory in Oklahoma is located in Ponca, and that was located there after the enactment of the Payne law. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Chairman, I did not undertake to answer for the district of my Republican colleague [Mr. McGUIRE], but I was speaking of mine, as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] has referred to it. The Ponca City one is not making very great progress at present, as my colleague will admit, and the lead mines in Oklahoma do not need any protection greater now than they have had for years, and they are not clamoring in my district for that protection.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

We have in northern Idaho about 12,000 people dependent directly or indirectly on the operation of our lead mines, which produce over 30 per cent of the supply of the United States. Nearly \$5,000,000 yearly goes to the railroads for freights in transporting the products of the mines and the mills, and merchandise needed by the communities which are sustained by this industry. In addition, the wages of the miners, supplies, rents, and so forth, amount to nearly \$10,000,000 per year. This industry has been built up under a protective tariff of 1½ per cent on lead ore. In addition to the mines in operation, there are a great many prospective mines which are being developed at great expense and this development will be abandoned in many instances if lead miners are compelled to enter the market in competition with Mexican ores. The latest statistics compiled by the census report shows that out of 2,185 mines reported, only 154 were producing mines. The total capital invested was

\$72,738,889, 44 per cent of which was invested in prospective mines, all of which would be a total loss if the lead producers are not to have the benefit of existing protective laws. I can not understand how any man who loves his country and who is interested in the happiness and welfare of his neighbors could support a measure which would place them on a par with the cheap labor of Mexico, who receive one-fourth of the wages received by the miners in Idaho.

Note the comparison between the wages paid in Idaho and Mexico:

	Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.	Mexico.
Miners.....	\$3.50 to \$4.50	\$0.75
Muckers.....	3.00 to 3.50	.50
Laborers.....	3.00 to 3.50	.50
Timbermen.....	3.50 to 4.00	.75 to \$1.00
Pumpmen.....	4.00	1.00
Engineers.....	4.50 to 5.00	1.00
Shift bosses.....	5.00 to 6.00	1.00
Track and pipe men.....	3.50 to 4.00	1.00
Blacksmiths.....	4.00 to 5.00	1.00 to 1.25
Blacksmith's helpers.....	3.50 to 4.00	.75
Machinists.....	4.50 to 5.00	1.00
Millmen.....	3.50 to 4.00	.65
Average.....	3.60	.80
Day's work.....	8 hours.	10 to 12 hours.

Who would be benefited by the proposed reduction of the duty and the suspension of the lead-mining industry in the United States? Why should we send our money out of the country for those things that are now being produced by ourselves? [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER], on this side of the House, offered an amendment relating to hooks and eyes used in boots and shoes, and made an observation concerning boots and shoes being on the free list. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], who prepared this schedule, and who is in charge of it, endeavoring to reflect upon his colleague from Pennsylvania, stated that he was surprised that a gentleman on the floor of the House would make a proposition to the House which might affect his own pocket or his own business, and that it was improper, or words to that effect, for the president or ex-president of the United States Shoe Manufacturers' Association to propose an amendment upon the floor of the House affecting the shoe business.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose next we will be told that gentlemen in this House who own farms or who are interested in agriculture have no right to propose amendments or to vote upon propositions affecting the tariff upon agricultural products; but think of a speech of that sort coming from one of the older Members of this House, when the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] who introduced the bill affecting the tariff upon iron and steel products is himself an iron and steel manufacturer!

Think of a gentleman making that observation relating to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER], saying that it was improper for him to propose an amendment affecting the tariff upon boots and shoes when he was the president of the Shoe Manufacturers' Association, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania himself secured iron ore free, the principal user of which is located in his district! [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, and the gentleman might have added that they were also making 20 per cent profit on the investment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has brought me personally into this question.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman, if he will permit me, that I did not do it with any reflection upon the gentleman from Alabama. The gentleman from Alabama does not need to defend himself upon the floor of this House, so far as this tariff bill concerns his own business, and no one has ever charged him with attempting to use his official position to improperly advantage himself in his private business. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for what he says, but the only business in which I am interested is the pig-iron business and the iron and steel business in my own district. There is not an item in it that has not been

reduced in this bill. So far as the Birmingham district is concerned, its great iron supply has been put upon the free list, for the benefit of the country generally.

The coal that it produces has gone to the free list. The greatest manufacturing plant in the district is a steel-rail mill, and rails have gone to the free list, because that industry is controlled by a monopoly. The next greatest plant in the district is a wire plant, and a part of their product has gone to the free list. I do not mean to say that I would have advocated putting these articles on the free list if I thought that they ought to bear a revenue tax. The item in this bill that I am more interested in than any other is pig iron, and although the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] cut the rate on pig iron from \$4 to \$2.50 in his bill, in this bill we cut the rate from \$2.50 specific to 8 per cent ad valorem, which, at \$15 pig iron, would mean \$1.20 a ton, or a cut of 50 per cent. If I could not represent my constituency and at the same time represent the people of the United States without involving myself in a question of feeling I had to be a special pleader for interests that happen to be located in my district, I would be unworthy to occupy the position I hold in this House and unworthy to bear a commission from the great Democratic Party of this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I have no criticism of a gentleman who comes here to represent the interests of his constituency. I have no criticism of the gentleman from Pennsylvania who desired to lower a duty on a product that he buys and at the same time contends for a raise of a duty on the product that he sells. I do not question the gentleman's motive in the case, but I contend this—that when Representatives of the American people stand in this House and exercise the power to tax the people of this country and lay on their backs burdens of taxation, at least it is not becoming for gentlemen to display a selfish interest in these matters. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The time has passed when the laws of this country shall longer be written for special interests [applause on the Democratic side]; when men may come to this Congress and ask for legislation that shall convert the dollar from the pockets of the American people into their own pockets that they may grow rich as the result of that legislation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

152. Tinsel wire, lame or lahn, made wholly or in chief value of gold, silver, or other metal, 10 per cent ad valorem; bullions and metal threads, made wholly or in chief value of tinsel wire, lame or lahn, 30 per cent ad valorem; fabrics, ribbons, beltings, toys, or other articles, made wholly or in chief value of tinsel wire, lame or lahn, bullions, or metal threads, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 42, line 7, by inserting, after the word "remanufactured," the words "all the foregoing, 2½ cents per pound." Also, amend line 9 by striking out the words "25 per cent ad valorem" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "2½ cents per pound."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I have already spoken generally upon this subject, and I merely want at this time to make one or two observations that it seems to me are pertinent to consider when we are considering the question of reducing the duty upon lead imported into this country. I think that the Coeur d'Alene region of Idaho may be taken as a very fine example of a region where the laborers are benefited by a protective duty. That is a region of country in which almost all the laborers employed are American citizens. In fact, under the laws of Idaho no corporation may employ laborers who have not at least taken out their first papers as the first step looking to their naturalization. [Applause on the Republican side.] The average wages paid to laborers of the Coeur d'Alene is \$3.60 per man, and I would compare that with the average wages paid to the laborers in the mines of the Republic to the south of us, where the average is 80 cents per man. The miners in the Coeur d'Alene receive from \$3.50 to \$4.50 per day for their labor, while the miners in the mines of Mexico receive 75 cents per day. The muckers receive in the Coeur d'Alene from \$3 to \$3.50 for their labor, and the muckers in Mexico receive 50 cents per day. The blacksmiths employed in connection with mine work receive from \$4 to \$5 per day in Idaho, as compared with \$1 to \$1.25 per day in Mexico. And so you can go down the list, and you may compare the wages received by the various classes of workmen in the mines of the region that produces nearly one-third of the

lead of the United States and almost 10 per cent of the lead of the world, and you will find that the wages received on the average are more than 400 per cent of the wages received by the laborers in similar mines in the country immediately adjacent to the United States. More than that, let me say this:

The lead produced from the mines in the Coeur d'Alene region would not pay the running expenses and the freight to convey the lead to the markets of the world if it were not for the by-product of silver that is produced in connection with operating the mines of that region. The very fact that we are able to produce silver alongside of the lead enables our miners to work these mines and operate the same at a profit and pay good wages to the laborers in this country. If you were to insist upon reducing the schedule of duties upon lead imported from foreign countries into the United States anywhere near the ratio suggested by the bill you are considering at this time, it will mean that our miners will be compelled to accept lower wages than they are receiving at the present time or else the mines will cease to be operated.

Possibly both of these results will in part obtain, and I have no doubt but that so far as development work is considered in that region and other regions of the great West it will in large part cease or be retarded, because it will not seem to be a profitable business in which to engage. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

156. Metallic mineral substances in a crude state, and metals unwrought, whether capable of being wrought or not, not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem; monazite sand and thorite; thorium, oxide of and salts of; gas mantles treated with chemicals or metallic oxides, 25 per cent ad valorem; and gas-mantle scrap consisting in chief value of metallic oxides, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 42, line 14, after the word "gas," insert the words "kerosene or alcohol."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I desire to call the attention of the House to a communication relating to mantles, and so forth, carried in this bill, as follows:

LINDSAY LIGHT CO.,
Chicago, January 31, 1913.

JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: We respectfully urge that no change be made in the import duty under paragraph 183, Schedule C, tariff law 1909, which has particular reference to monazite sand, thorium, incandescent gas mantles, and gas-mantle scrap.

To support this request we submit the following facts: That there are no agreements of any kind pertaining to the sale of incandescent gas mantles; they are sold in open competition and without regulation of price.

Ninety-five per cent of the materials used in manufacturing gas mantles is dutiable under act of 1909 with 40 per cent and over, and the remaining 5 per cent is dutiable at 25 per cent.

All materials used in the manufacture of gas mantles cost us 30 per cent to 35 per cent more than the German manufacturer.

Our average wage rate is from \$1.10 to \$1.75 per day, and in some branches of the work more, against an average wage rate paid in Germany of 50 cents to 62 cents per day.

We know that the German manufacturer has an advantage in lower cost of labor and material, conservatively estimated at from \$18 to \$22 per thousand mantles.

Mantles of foreign manufacture are offered at extremely low prices, varying from \$25 to \$50 per thousand; present rate of duty adds \$10 to \$20 per thousand, and in reality the difference in cost is \$18 to \$22 per thousand.

We manufactured last year 8,600,000 mantles. We have no bonded indebtedness. We have no watered stock and conduct our enterprise in the most economical manner possible consistent with good manufacturing.

Our net profits for last year on gas mantles were \$32,473, which figures \$3.77 per 1,000, or a trifle more than one-third of a cent per mantle profit, which would be totally eliminated if any reduction in duty takes place.

Any reduction in the duty is not going to benefit the American consumer, for the reason the consumer's prices on gas mantles are 10 cents, 15 cents, and 25 cents, which at these figures will give the dealer profit varying from 40 per cent to 100 per cent. The dealer does not give the benefit possible to the consumer, and even if the public did get the benefit of this saving it would only be about \$300,000 for the entire United States, and for this the American industry, paying \$1,800,000 for labor, would be placed in a serious jeopardy.

We doubt very much if the proposed reduction on thorium will benefit the American manufacturer, for the reason that this particular item is controlled in Europe by a syndicate who would immediately take advantage of the new condition by raising their prices, and this then would go to Europe in place of the American manufacturer as reduced cost.

We sincerely hope that you will do everything possible to assist us. We are in favor of leaving the tariff as it now stands on gas mantles.

If it is consistent with this to procure a reduction on thorium, we would welcome it.

Your attention is respectfully called to printed petition presented to the members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Very truly, yours,

LINDSAY LIGHT CO.,
J. M. SHEERBURN,
Secretary.

The Clerk read as follows:

158. Pens, metallic, 8 cents per gross; with nib and barrel in one piece, 12 cents per gross.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This afternoon I endeavored to point out some of the paragraphs in which the duties had been increased in the present bill over the Underwood bill of the last Congress. Gentlemen complained because I pointed out only the increases. I now desire to point out one of the decreases in this bill. Under the Payne law metallic pens, with nib and barrel in one piece, were dutiable at 15 cents per gross. Under the Underwood bill of the last Congress they were made dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem, a duty equivalent to 47 cents per gross, or 200 per cent more than the duty of the Payne law. I congratulate the gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee on having discovered this error and having reduced this duty to 12 cents per gross. However, I rose to direct the attention of the committee to another matter. The present law, paragraph 186, reads as follows:

Pens, metallic, except gold pens, 12 cents per gross.

The language "except gold pens" is stricken out in the present law. In paragraph 187 there is a proviso which reads as follows:

Provided, That pens and penholders shall be assessed for duty separately.

That has been stricken out of the bill, so that gold pens, if the laws remains in its present form, will be dutiable under paragraph 158 at the rate of 12 cents per gross, a duty very much lower than that contained in the present law.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Has the gentleman read paragraph 159?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have read paragraph 159.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman is talking about gold pens, is he not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Paragraph 159 reads:

Penholder tips, penholders and parts thereof, gold pens, fountain pens, and stenographic pens.

Mr. ANDERSON. That paragraph applies only to pens and penholders attached, and unless the ambiguity is corrected gold pens without holders attached will be dutiable under the other paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman will have to learn some constructions from the new customs court, I guess.

The Clerk read as follows:

162. Type metal, on the lead contained therein, and new types, 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee). The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 13, strike out the words "on the lead contained therein."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I also offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 13, strike out the word "new."

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to put in the Record that that paragraph, 640 of the free list, provides for type fit only to be remanufactured, so that the word "new" is stricken out here because it is practically covered by the two clauses thus together.

Mr. MANN. Should it not also provide:

Not otherwise provided for in this section.

Mr. PALMER. I think not. The Treasury experts say not. Types to be remanufactured are to come in free.

Mr. MANN. It is proposed to strike out the word "new" and make it "type."

Mr. PALMER. To make it "type," so that all type comes in at this rate with the exception, of course, that the free list provides for old type, fit only to be remanufactured.

Mr. MANN. But there would be a plain conflict then, because this would include the other.

Mr. PALMER. The other is "old type, fit only to be remanufactured."

Mr. MANN. But if you strike out "new" here, this would carry all type at 15 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. PALMER. Provided it were fit only to be remanufactured.

Mr. MANN. There is no "provided" about it. The question is whether, unless you insert something else, that would not conflict with this.

Mr. PALMER. I offered that amendment at the suggestion of the Treasury Department, which, in the interest of the clear interpretation of the language in accordance with the intent, said that that word "new" ought to come out.

Mr. MANN. I agree with that part of it; but I think it would be a little safer to put the other language in, which could not harm anything.

Mr. PALMER. It may be so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

164. Zinc-bearing ores of all kinds, including calamine, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 44, lines 18 and 19, strike out the paragraph and insert the following in lieu thereof:

164. Zinc-bearing ore of all kinds, including calamine, containing less than 10 per cent of zinc, shall be admitted free of duty; containing 10 per cent or more of zinc and less than 20 per cent, $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 cent per pound on the zinc contained therein; containing 20 per cent or more of zinc and less than 25 per cent, $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 cent per pound on the zinc contained therein; containing 25 per cent of zinc, or more, 1 cent per pound on the zinc contained therein: *Provided*, That on all importations of zinc-bearing ores the duties shall be estimated at the port of entry, and a bond given in double the amount of such estimated duties for the transportation of the ores by common carriers bonded for the transportation of appraised or unappraised merchandise to properly equipped sampling or smelting establishments, whether designated as bonded warehouses or otherwise. On the arrival of the ores at such establishments they shall be sampled according to commercial methods under the supervision of Government officers, who shall be stationed at such establishments, and who shall submit the samples thus obtained to a Government assayer, designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall make a proper assay of the sample, and report the result to the proper customs officers, and the import entries shall be liquidated thereon, except in case of ores that shall be removed to a bonded warehouse to be refined for exportation as provided by law. And the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make all necessary regulations to enforce the provisions of this paragraph.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this is an industry in my district, and I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. MANN. There are two other gentlemen who desire time.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say 15 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DECKER] states that he desires five minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will make it 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] modifies his request and asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph close in 20 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of continuing the zinc ore mining industry in the United States, and especially in my own district.

It is proposed to reduce the ad valorem rate from an average of 50 per cent to 10 per cent.

With apologies to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PALMER], I state that I own no stock in any ore mines anywhere. But I am interested in those men who are employed in that industry in my district. The industry is carried on by individuals. Men group themselves together, put their capital together, and go down into the earth to get the ore. The ore production in that section of country is not under the control of

any great combinations of capital, but is carried on by individual efforts, and the men employed by these men are dependent upon that industry for their livelihood and for their prosperity.

I have seen those men lose their employment as the result of competition with old Mexico in the production of zinc ore under free trade. I have seen the same men find employment again as the result of the protection given to the zinc-ore industry in 1909 by the present law. The men were out of employment as the result of competition with Mexican miners, who get from one-fifth to one-ninth of the wage that is paid to the laborers in Kansas. The reason the laborers in Kansas were out of employment in the zinc-mining industry was because they could not live upon the same wage that the men in Mexico were getting who were supplying the smelters in my district with zinc ore.

I urged a duty then to protect them from that competition. I am urging now a duty high enough to protect the laborers employed in that industry, to the end that they may have an opportunity of supplying their families with the necessities of life and the opportunity of living in the manner in which they have been accustomed to live. That is all that is asked. They can not do that if Mexican peons mine the ore that supplies the smelters of the United States. In 1910 and 1912—I have not the figures for 1911—there were imported 41,750,564 pounds of zinc ore, for which the United States paid \$747,554. There was imported free of duty \$354,442, making a total of \$1,097,996 of American money that was paid for Mexican ore, money that should have been paid to American laborers in our own country at a wage of from five to nine times as high as that which is paid to the laborers in old Mexico for mining ore. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Gentlemen upon this floor represent districts the people of which are mightily interested in this section. I am wondering what they will do. I am wondering how they will vote upon this amendment. I trust that they will vote to continue employment for the thousands of laborers in their districts and for the prosperity of the communities in which they live. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. We have discovered in four or five of the counties of eastern Tennessee a very valuable zinc ore, and during the last six months more than one-half million dollars have been invested in purchasing these zinc lands, building houses, and so forth. A very large and expensive plant is now in course of construction in Knox County, and the contractors are building 150 houses for the operatives of that plant alone.

Since the passage of the Payne-Aldrich bill Boston or eastern capital has been developing the zinc business in Jefferson County. If this duty written in the Underwood bill becomes a law, that promising industry in eastern Tennessee will be at an end or a suspension of operations until the Republican Party comes back into power four years from now and writes protection for the zinc industry of America.

Not only is Tennessee interested in zinc ore, but Arkansas, Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma are interested in it, and the Democratic Member [Mr. DECKER] who represents the Joplin (Mo.) district will, I have no doubt, bear testimony to the fact that thousands of dollars are invested in the zinc industry in his district, and more than 50,000 people in that State are affected directly and indirectly by the growth and prosperity of that industry.

Now, gentlemen, why did you cut this duty to this small amount? Did you do it in the interest of Missouri zinc, Tennessee zinc, Kansas zinc, Oklahoma zinc, or Arkansas zinc? Be honest and tell us if you did not do it in the interest of the New Jersey Zinc Co., which, I understand, has large holdings of zinc lands in Mexico, and its smelter is located on or near tidewater in New Jersey?

I know the Ways and Means Committee, on page 7 of its report, attempts to justify its course in putting coal, iron ore, and bauxite on the free list, and zinc, lead, gypsum, and barytes practically on the free list, under this paragraph of said report:

REDUCTION OF RESOURCES.

That the speedy exhaustion of many natural resources is to be feared unless access to a fresh supply is gained no one who considers the subject from an unbiased standpoint can doubt. This is noticeably true in the case of such articles as timber, ores, minerals, and other substances whose supply can not be increased, and whose exhaustion is merely a question of the rate at which they are taken from their original sources.

Now, listen to this declaration in the Democratic national platform of 1912:

OUR MINERAL RESOURCES.

We rejoice in the inheritance of mineral resources unequalled in extent, variety, or value, and in the development of the mining industry, unequalled in its magnitude and importance.

If that plank in the Democratic national platform about our resources being unlimited is true, why do you propose to go to Mexico for our lead and zinc, to France for our bauxite, Nova Scotia for our coal, and Cuba, Sweden, and Spain for our iron ore?

Oh, you can depress and injure this southern and western industry. You can do it in the interest of American smelters which own cheap ore lands in foreign countries. You may talk here about the "vested and special interests" of this country, and you may criticize the manufacturers of America, but you do not make a single complaint or criticism of the agents and importers who are the representatives of every foreign manufacturer fighting before your committee for a reduction of duty for the benefit of the "vested and special interests" on foreign shores.

Why should not an American manufacturer who puts his capital into the development of our resources, to give employment to our people, to furnish transportation to the railroads, and wages for the laboring people, appeal to the law-making body of this country for a hearing on legislation which affects his business and the interest of the men he gives employment to at the highest known wages. The importers are given hearings. The importers of the great city of New York, seeking to flood the country with foreign goods at the expense of American mills and factories, are heard and heeded. Every line of the bill slows that it is written in the interests of the manufacturers and wage earners across the sea. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman, the greatest zinc-producing country in the world comprises part of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. In my district there is also a large agricultural section made up of a loyal and intelligent and patriotic citizenship. For the honor which I have of occupying a seat in this body, I am indebted in a large measure to men engaged in the mining of zinc ore, and especially am I indebted to the men who do the actual work of mining zinc ore. About 14 years ago I went from law school to the city of Joplin, and from that day to this my best personal, professional, and political friends have been the brave men who every morning when the whistles blow go down into the ground with their lamps on their caps and their picks in their hands to dig for their daily bread.

And if I should fail in doing what I think to be for their best interests I would be unworthy of their friendship and their confidence. I told the farmers of my district at the schoolhouses, I told the merchants and the business men in the agricultural towns, I told the miners at the mouths of the shafts, I told them in their homes, I told them in the halls where they assembled to hear me speak, that I was a Democrat, that I did not believe it was the province of Government to tax one man to make another prosperous. I reminded them also that it was the consumer who paid the tariff and that the vast majority of consumers were made up of laboring men; that I believed in a tariff for revenue only; but I told them each and all that so long as the revenue to run this Government was raised by means of a tariff and so long as the brave miners of my district paid a tariff tax to the Federal Government on the hats on their heads, their underclothes, their coats, their pants, their socks, their shoes, the lumber with which they built their homes, their furniture, and the food upon their tables, I would insist that the people of other parts of the United States should also pay a revenue tariff on the only thing which the miners of my district produced.

I did not promise them that in order to get what I thought was the proper tariff on zinc ore I would join with and vote with men who believed in placing exorbitant and prohibitive and unjust tariffs on commodities produced in other parts of this country. I told them plainly that I would not do so, but that I would present their case from the Democratic standpoint of fairness to all the people, and here and now I wish to say that I have kept my pledge.

Since my election I have worked to carry out this pledge. In the Underwood bill of two years ago zinc ore was placed upon the free list. Before the opening of the last session of the Sixty-second Congress, at my own expense, I went to Birmingham, Ala., to place my views before the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. In season and out of season, publicly and privately, I have presented those views to the other members of the Ways and Means Committee and to the members of the Democratic caucus. The Ways and Means Committee have agreed in part to my views—I do not mean entirely on account of my arguments—and have placed a revenue duty of 10 per cent ad valorem on zinc ore. This was only part of what I asked. I believe I was right when I advocated a higher duty, and I have not changed my views. And I do not

apologize to any man—Republican or Democrat—who may differ from me on that proposition. But the great Democratic Party, to which I belong and in whose principles I believe, has been commissioned by the people of this country to revise the tariff, and revise it downward, and I also believe that two-thirds of the Republicans and Progressives believe in a downward revision of the tariff. This bill we are about to pass will affect directly or indirectly over ninety millions of people. If all those people could assemble here for the purpose of writing this bill, there could not be found two out of the ninety millions who would agree in every particular. If out of all the people of this country two men were given authority to make this bill, they could not agree in every particular. And whether this bill were written by ninety millions of people directly or by two people, it would have to be the result of concession and compromise. The only practical way yet devised for the enactment of such a law is for those representatives of the people who believe in the general principles of revision downward to meet together in a caucus, which caucus, after giving a free, fair, and full discussion and vote upon different items, becomes binding.

Gentlemen of the committee, I participated in such a caucus and that caucus after full, fair, and free discussion and vote upon different items has reduced the tariff tax which the miners of my district must pay upon the things which they consume; that caucus has reduced the tariff on hats and pants and socks and shoes, on furniture and on food and lumber, the things which the miners of my district consume, and it has also made a reduction in the tariff tax on zinc ore, the thing which these same miners produce. And while I have not changed my views, and while I still believe that this reduction in the tariff on zinc has been greater than is wise, yet I participated in this caucus and I am going to abide by this caucus. And when the miners of my district understand what I have done and why I have done it, as I will give them to understand, I believe they will approve my course.

I am going to vote for this bill, not only because it has the indorsement of the great Ways and Means Committee, in which the country has confidence, not only because it has been indorsed by this Democratic caucus of which I speak, but also because I believe as a whole it is a good bill and because, in spite of all the Republican prophecies of calamity and distress and in spite of temporary disturbances necessary to readjustments in business, I believe the patriotism of the people of this country is stronger than partisanship, and because I believe that this bill after being passed and perhaps modified and improved by a Democratic Senate, a coordinate branch of this Government, and after being signed by a great Democratic President, will receive the ultimate approval of a benefited people. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CAMPBELL), there were—ayes 60, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

165. Zinc in blocks, pigs, or sheets, and zinc dust; and old and worn-out zinc fit only to be remanufactured, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 20, strike out the paragraph and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"165. Zinc in blocks or pigs and zinc dust, 1½ cents per pound; in sheets, 1½ cents per pound; in sheets, coated or plated with nickel or other metal or solutions, 1½ cents per pound; old and worn-out, fit only to be remanufactured, 1 cent per pound."

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, the reduction made in the Underwood bill upon the products of the zinc smelter is greater than the reduction made on almost any other industry. There is no labor employed anywhere in the country that works harder than the labor employed in the smelters. They get about four times the wage that the zinc-smelter workers receive in any other country that competes with them in the production of zinc products. They have not been able to compete with the labor that is thus paid a less wage with the rates of duty that are provided even by the present law, for in the last three years great quantities of zinc spelter and zinc sheets and blocks have been imported into the United States, amounting in the aggregate to 31,508,276 pounds, for which the United States paid \$1,550,554. There was an ad valorem rate of 32.37 per cent on zinc spelter and blocks so imported, and that rate of duty was paid upon the importation of over 31,000,000 pounds of zinc products for which the United States paid over a million and a half dollars. The reduction is from 32.37 per cent to 10. That will encourage a vastly larger importation of zinc products than we have had heretofore. Zinc ore can be

mined in old Mexico, as I stated a moment ago, for from one-fifth to one-ninth of what it can be mined here, taken to Belgium, smelted there, and sent back to Pittsburgh, Pa., the State represented by the gentleman who prepared this schedule, at a less freight rate than zinc spelter can be taken from my district to Pittsburgh, Pa., and I will state here that the State of Pennsylvania, that has large steel industries, consumes 95 per cent of the zinc spelter produced in the United States.

I have sometimes wondered if these great reductions in zinc in all its grades from the zinc ore to the product of zinc ore has been made for the purpose of giving a compensation to the steel industry for the reductions that have been made in the products of that industry in the United States.

Is this a sort of sop to the steel industry? While you take off duties on products of the steel industry you give practically free trade in one of their raw materials. Was that the purpose of reducing the duty on zinc spelter? Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania answer? Why was the reduction made? The people who are interested in the manufacture of zinc spelter have large investments in the industry. The industry will be destroyed, and the factories will undoubtedly close when their product comes in competition with the importations that will come from other countries under the advantages given to imports by this bill. The hundreds of men employed in these industries and their families will suffer. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DECKER], who spoke in apology for the vote which he intends to cast against the welfare of the people of his district, gave a thrust at some of the laborers whom he says are employed in my district. He stated there were coal miners there who were there under contract. I challenge him or any other man to designate a single coal miner who is employed in my district under improper contract. He stepped out of his way to make a gratuitous charge against the coal miners in my district he can not sustain. The men of whom he so sneeringly speaks are honest and industrious and are engaged in hazardous employment in which they contribute a large share to the common welfare. Democrats pose as the friends of laboring men, but that friendship is not shown in this bill or by what is said by Democrats in defense of it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished young friend from Missouri [Mr. DECKER] who made a very eloquent speech a moment ago, in a way congratulated himself, and I think possibly is entitled to congratulation, that he had gotten the Ways and Means Committee to add 10 per cent ad valorem tax on zinc ore, that is produced in his district. Evidently when he had secured this increase from the bill of a year ago his zest cooled, because I find that in the Underwood metal schedule bill of a year ago, while they put zinc ore on the free list, the manufactured product from zinc ore was put upon the dutiable list at 15 per cent ad valorem, while this year, owing to the effort of my distinguished friend from Missouri possibly, they have put zinc ore on the dutiable list at 10 per cent and reduced the duty on the zinc sheets to 10 per cent ad valorem, and where before the raw material was free and a 15 per cent rate put upon the finished product, owing to his endeavors they now put the same rate of duty on the raw material and the finished product, which will probably result not only in the closing of the mines where they produce zinc ore but in the smelting establishments where they produce zinc sheets and blocks and pigs. I congratulate him upon his success. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman want to speak on this paragraph?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, they produce zinc in the district of the gentleman from Kansas, and therefore I think the gentleman from Kansas owes an apology to the gentleman from Alabama for advocating a duty on zinc, because, if I correctly understood the gentleman a moment ago, the doctrine he now pronounces and stands for is that any Member rising on the floor of the House for the purpose of protecting the labor and the industry of his district is thereby a special pleader for special interests and not worthy of a place in the House. To me that is a rather remarkable doctrine. Our sophomore young friend from Missouri [Mr. DECKER], who did scratch through with a bare majority, admits that he told the people in his district that he would stand for a duty on their products

so long as there were duties on other products. I shall leave it to the people of his district to decide whether or no he has kept his word. He cooed mildly here this evening as compared with the way he roared in the caucus, if he is correctly quoted, for there it is said, or has been said by the newspapers, that the gentleman went so far as to criticize a coordinate branch of the Government which holds the veto power for having had too much to do with this tariff, and he insisted that the rate now carried in the bill for which he now proposes to vote would be injurious to the people of his district.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. If the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, I wish to correct an injustice in that respect that was done to the gentleman from Missouri. I was present in the caucus, and no such attack was made by the gentleman from Missouri as was quoted of him in the newspapers.

Mr. HENSLEY. I will say to the gentleman that no reference to the President was made in his speech.

Mr. MANN. If you had an open caucus they would not have had it wrong. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the newspapers will apologize to the gentleman from Missouri. I simply made the statement as it was made in the public press, the best evidence available, as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] suggests. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], pronouncing the new doctrine that we are not to stand for the labor and industries in our districts, referred to the industries in his district by way of illustration—to the industries of his district where rates had been reduced. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said, the gentleman from Alabama is not called upon to defend himself relative to his action in regard to this bill. However much we disagree with his views and opinions, no man here will and no man elsewhere ought to question his sincerity and his honesty, and I think no one does. And yet I think the gentleman from Alabama would scarcely say that he has placed a rate in this bill that he believes would be destructive of an industry in his district. Down in Alabama they work black men, and they work them mighty cheap, and down in Alabama the coal is on one side of the hill and the ore on the other. And down in Alabama, as the gentleman from that State has told us, they make pig iron cheaper than anywhere else on earth, and, therefore, no rate that the gentleman could fix could injure the industries of his district unless it was absolutely and totally destructive of the industries of the entire balance of the country.

While we all realize and appreciate the fact that the gentleman has not, in framing this bill, attempted to give an industry in his district a rate more than it needs, I repeat that the gentleman from Alabama certainly will not say that he has placed any rate so low that he believes that an industry in his district will be destroyed or seriously injured by that rate. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] I do not think fully appreciated what I said. I stated awhile ago, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania had offered to put on the free list, or started to put on the free list, an article in which he was interested, and at the same time contended for a higher rate on another article in which he was interested, that I did not impugn his personal motives in the matter, but I thought he had put himself in a rather contradictory position in this House. Now, I do not for one minute contend that any man on the floor of this House, on either side, ought not to represent the constituency that sends him here. But I did say, and I say it now, that he ought not to represent the special interests of his district, whether he is a part of them or whether he is not. That is the distinction. The man who comes here with an open and a free mind and votes what he believes is for the interest of the people of his district and abroad at the same time, and votes for the interests of all the people of the United States, is free to stand here and vote as he pleases without any man having the right to say yea or nay. But when a man stands on this floor from any district in the United States, coming here with the selfish purpose of representing a special interest in his district or in the country and not the interest of the great masses of the people of this country, I say the time has come in the American Congress when this House is not large enough to hold him in the future. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MONDELL. I understand the gentleman to say that any Member is justified to stand for in a proper way and uphold the industries of his district, and no man has the right to say him nay. How about the caucus—the secret and binding caucus?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The difference between some gentlemen on that side of the House—not the gentleman from Wyoming—

and men on this side of the House is this: Individualism has broken loose in the ranks of the Republican Party, but not with the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]. He is an organized soldier. We believe in party government. We believe that the great principles that should govern this Nation can only be written on the statute books by virtue of a united and great party standing for those principles and maintaining them, and for that reason we surrender our individuality to the wisdom and the cohesive strength of a great party, founded on principles that have not only been the foundation of our Republic, but the keystone of the liberty of the people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

On that side of the House your organization is broken. You once believed in party government; some of you—my friend from Wyoming still believes it—but there are few on that side of the House that are bold enough to stand out and say to-day that they believe in the government by the Republican Party instead of individualism.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has been able to fix the exact date on which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] became such enthusiasts over an open caucus? It must have been very recent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I will not try to analyze the gentlemen on that side of the House, because you and I know where they stand. There are two that we can be sponsor for on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

167. All steam engines, steam locomotives, printing presses, and machine tools, 15 per cent ad valorem; embroidering machines, and lace-making machines, including machines for making lace curtains, nets, or nettings, 25 per cent ad valorem; machine tools as used in this paragraph shall be held to mean any machine operated by other than hand power which employs a tool for working on metal.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. PAYNE. For a great many years in the various tariff bills there were a number of articles that came in under what we called the "catch-all" clause—articles not otherwise provided for—and they escaped in each revision of the tariff without much notice being taken of them and without Members looking through to see what articles came in under that clause. When they had the Wilson bill of 1894 under consideration that paragraph passed without any amendments and without any inquiries being made in regard to it, although our friends on the other side were then, as now, making a tariff bill. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I take considerable pride in the fact that four years ago the Ways and Means Committee inquired into the various articles that were coming in under that paragraph. They were not enumerated in any way in the Government reports except as "other articles not otherwise provided for." We did not know what they were.

I remember that we had to send for witnesses from the customhouses in the country to find out what articles were coming in under that "catch-all" paragraph, and we got a list of them, as far as we were able. Then, we proceeded to separate them, and thereupon we laid the foundation for paragraph No. 167 of the present bill, now under consideration.

I remember that instead of putting a duty of 45 per cent on steam engines and locomotives and printing presses and machine tools, we put a duty of 30 per cent ad valorem on them. We took off a third of the duty.

By the way, it was pretty difficult to get much account of these articles, as to their comparative cost in this country and foreign countries; but we went about it, and made the best revision we could. Then we took up the question of linotype and typesetting machines, sewing machines, typewriters, and so forth, and reduced the duty to 30 per cent ad valorem.

Then we came to the question of machines for making embroidery. Some few had been imported into the United States, and there was quite a little industry here in connection with them. But it was not what we ought to have in making these machine laces in the country, and so we drew a provision, keeping the duty of 45 per cent on the machines, none of which were made in this country, but providing that until January 1, 1911, they should be on the free list—for two years after the bill went into effect.

The result was that factories were built, these machines were introduced into this country, and this industry was started up and has grown into a great and prosperous industry.

We put the limit of time on it in order to hurry up the starting of the industry. We also enacted a provision that if they did not do it within two years the duty would go back again. We believed that of course it would enable them to start the industry quickly, and that at the same time it would be a sort of protection to the machines that came here. We got enough of them at that time to cover the industry, and now I see that my friends have put a duty of 25 per cent on these lace-making machines. Probably that is a sufficient duty.

We put on printing presses a duty of 30 per cent. The Democratic Congress put them on the free list a year ago. They had them again on the free list when this present bill now under consideration was first reported in the newspapers this year. They put them on the free list, I say, along with paper for printing newspapers and magazines. Of course it was only a coincidence that it happened to be that that was a proper thing to do in a revenue tariff bill. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Type were also put at a lower rate of duty on this bill, and that was only another coincidence. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.] Perish the thought that the gentlemen who fixed these duties had any idea that they were going to get special favors for their people or for themselves or for their party in consequence of putting these things on the free list! [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

We put print paper on the dutiable list because we thought the manufacture of print paper was an industry that ought to be protected, and we are protectionists. We left this duty on printing presses because we thought the manufacture of those presses was an industry that ought to be protected in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to have one more minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from New York will proceed for one minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, the gentlemen in the committee and in the caucus changed the item and took printing presses suddenly from the free list one day and put on them a duty of 15 per cent. Of course they did not do it for the sake of protecting the industry! Oh, no! I was receiving every day copies of letters sent to the chairman of the committee protesting on the part of the manufacturers of these presses that the industry would be wiped out unless they kept on the duty of 30 per cent. They restored at least half the duty, but that action had no connection with the action of the committee or the action of the caucus, and did not even soften the rigorous mind of the President of the United States. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MANN. Oh, no!

Mr. PAYNE. Not at all. It was a proper revenue duty at 15 per cent, and they even dared to brave the anger of the daily papers and the muckraking magazines and all that sort of thing. But what I want to do is to call the attention of that side of the House, as I have for the last two days, to the fact that the Payne bill was a revision downward on these articles; and I have called attention now to different items in the bill, enough to convince any man with an open mind and an honest mind, so that he will admit the fact that it was, as it proved to be from the statistics for the last four years, the greatest revision downward ever made in any tariff bill in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Alabama a question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan. Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I received a letter a few days ago inquiring about steam pumps. A gentleman who manufactures them wants to know whether they would be classified under section 167, at 15 per cent, or under 169, at 25 per cent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. They have always been in the basket clause, 169, at 25 per cent.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I am very much obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The duty on the basket clause has been reduced from 45 to 25 per cent, and steam pumps fall in that catalogue.

I desire to occupy the time of the House for a few minutes only on the question of machine tools.

The bill which we reported last year had machine tools on the free list. The Payne bill carried them at the rate of 30 per cent ad valorem.

There are about \$50,000,000 production of machine tools in this country, of which \$5,000,000 are exported abroad. A portion of these exports of machine tools go to Germany, where they pay an 8 per cent tariff duty to get into that country after paying the freight.

When the committee first considered this question they believed that an industry that could send one-tenth of its product abroad, pay a tariff rate to get into another country, and compete there needed no duty here and that we could not get revenue from it. On further investigation we found out that the facts I have stated were absolutely true as to the highly organized machine tools; but we also found that there were some lower grades of machine tools that to a slight extent were now imported and that would probably be imported under a low rate of duty. We considered the question of endeavoring to differentiate between the highly organized machine tools and the low-grade machine tools. There was no point where we could establish a dividing line, and therefore, in order to be on the safe side of the question and levy a rate that would produce some revenue, and believing that this 15 per cent on machine tools would produce some revenue, we concluded that we would be conservative in the matter and cut the rate in the Payne bill from 30 per cent to 15 per cent.

I have no apology to make for the committee changing its rate from the bill of last year to the rate of this year. If the Ways and Means Committee should make up its mind that it could not err and should never change, it would undoubtedly be disqualified for performing the functions that are imposed on it by this House; and although I have some doubt myself now as to whether this industry really needs this 15 per cent, or as to how far it will be competitive, I think it was safer to put the 15 per cent rate in and try it out and see the result, although I am doubtful as to whether they would have been seriously hurt if we had put them absolutely on the free list.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he was undecided still as to whether this machine-tool industry needed this 15 per cent protection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I did not say I was undecided. I said I was in doubt.

Mr. COOPER. As to whether this industry needed this 15 per cent protection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not say protection. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman said whether the industry needed this 15 per cent—for what?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. For what?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman from Alabama said he was undecided as to whether this machine-tool industry needed this 15 per cent. What did he mean?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I did not mean "what."

Mr. COOPER. If the industry needed 15 per cent, it meant 15 per cent protection, because the industry would not get the revenue.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will tell the gentleman. I was in doubt as to whether we should make this reduction gradually by cutting it in half, or put it absolutely on the free list, and I am free to say that I am in doubt now as to which would be the proper position; but we resolved the doubt in favor of 15 per cent.

I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

168. Nippers and pliers of all kinds wholly or partly manufactured, 30 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Nippers and pliers in this paragraph carry a duty of 30 per cent and machine tools in the former paragraph a duty of 15 per cent; they were free in the former Underwood bill. These tools are all of a somewhat similar character, so far as their manufacture is concerned. I do not understand why the gentleman from Alabama had difficulty in determining whether machine tools needed 15 per cent duty when he has seen fit to place 30 per cent duty on nippers and pliers, and I am wondering if the manufacture of one of these two articles constitutes

what the gentleman from Alabama refers to as a special interest.

The gentleman, a few moments ago, somewhat modified his statement made earlier as to what it was proper for us to do in defending the labor and industry of our district. He now suggests that it is proper to do that, and our duty to do it, except that we must not stand for special interests. I am anxious to know when I am right and when I am wrong. I want to analyze his theory from the standpoint of my own district.

About half the people in my district and State are interested one way or the other, directly or indirectly, in the growing of sheep and wool—in the prosperity of the industry. I have no interest in it personally at all. Is that a special interest? Perhaps 25 per cent of the people in my district are more or less interested in growing cattle and horses. I own a Shetland pony and a few milk cows. Otherwise I have no personal interest. Is that a special interest? We mine coal in the State of Wyoming, and we are the only State except West Virginia that is hard hit by this bill through placing coal on the free list. I have no interest in coal mines. Is that a special interest?

We are looking forward to the time when we can have sugar-beet factories. We have them in the neighboring States. I have no sugar-beet land, and have no personal interest in the growing of sugar beets. Is that a special interest?

The difference between the gentleman from Alabama and myself is that I assume that I was sent here as a Representative of my district to do those things that I can honestly do and do in accordance with my declared purpose, and in accordance with the policy outlined and declared by my party to aid in the development of my State and in the maintenance of favorable wage conditions among my people and do it openly, while he seems to believe that the proper thing to do is to disavow any effort on behalf of his own people. I think he will hardly claim that he really intends injury to come to them.

I do not understand that these interests of my people are special interests, and if they be they are my special interests and it is my special duty here to protect them so far as I am able to do so, and consistently with the interests of all. I do not stop at the boundaries of my State, but I stand as ready and willing to give the same adequate protection to the labor and industry of every other State that I ask for the labor and industry of my State. It will be a sad day for the American people when it shall be held that it is not proper for a representative of the people to stand here and protest when they believe in their hearts that proposed legislation is not only going to injure them but it is going to be injurious to the entire body of the people. The Republican doctrine of protection is not a haphazard thing, striking here and helping there and protecting and building up one region and industry and withholding needed protection elsewhere, but a mosaic of prosperity and plenty, a beautiful picture of fair rewards to every industry and every labor under the flag. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to enter into any controversy with the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, nor did I mean to reflect in any way in the statement I made this afternoon in reference to the employment of labor in the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., in the great State of Alabama or the city of Birmingham.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to object to the gentleman's speaking; in fact I invite it, and I hope the gentleman will have the privilege extended to him by the House; but I call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Kentucky has been speaking on a subject in which he is interested and has convictions upon three times already without addressing himself to a paragraph in the bill.

I had the privilege of speaking twice. He and I had a little colloquy respecting some of the remarks he chose to make. I am not averse to continuing that. I shall be pleased to continue it. I invite it, but I do ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] is to have this additional time, to not object to giving me the courtesy of 10 minutes—5 minutes that he has already used and 5 minutes that he proposes to use now—in order that I may present my side of the case.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I give notice now that I shall insist upon the enforcement of the rule in reference to the pertinency of debate until 11 o'clock, and after that I hope we will adjourn until to-morrow.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to make any speech or any reference to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. I have put the facts in the Record, and that is all that is necessary.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reply to those figures that the gentleman put in the Record.

Mr. STANLEY. I decline to be interrupted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized and will proceed in order.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that the statements I made were from the sworn testimony of Mr. Harrison, of the Sage Foundation—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order at this time of the night that the gentleman is not proceeding in order.

Mr. STANLEY. I hope the gentleman will indulge me half a minute. I am not going to make a speech.

Mr. MANN. I withhold the point of order for half a minute.

Mr. STANLEY. They were made by Mr. Harrison, of the Sage Foundation, from his own personal observation, giving the number of convicts in mines, the offenses for which they were committed, the place from which they were taken, the circumstances under which they were held, and he states they were there for petty misdemeanors committed in the county in which the city of Birmingham is located, and he gives the number of them and the character of their imprisonment, and the persons in charge of them, and so forth. I will ask to put Mr. Harrison's statement in the RECORD, not as contradicting the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] but as showing the authority from which I quoted. I would not desire to enter into any discussion with the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I did not challenge his statement to-day that there were convicts working in the mines or that there were men convicted of criminal offenses in my county, just as there are in every other county in the United States; but the gentleman from Kentucky stated that these great iron factories were being worked by convict labor.

Mr. STANLEY. Oh, no; I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is what the gentleman stated, and that they were dragnet the streets of Birmingham—and he referred to the district of the gentleman from Minnesota in the same way—for the purpose of gathering together this labor to produce these iron products. I would state to the gentleman—I do not like to say it again, but I said it before—that there never has been a convict worked in any of these foundries or factories. In some coal mines that do not produce anything but coal for domestic purposes there are convicts working, but they are not working in these blast furnaces; and the thing I objected to in the gentleman's statement was that it was a reflection on my constituency, and that the statement, whether it comes from the gentleman who is named in that book or otherwise, does not represent truthfully the condition in my district.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to raise any question as between the gentleman and myself upon that point. I simply wish to put the authority for my statements in the RECORD, as he purported to speak from his own personal knowledge. He may be very incorrect. I do not know, but in justice to myself I wish to have my authority for the statements put in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has the authority under the leave to print.

The CHAIRMAN. The leave to print is upon the bill.

Mr. MANN. I stated before that I would object to any special leaves to print in the House, when general leave has been granted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair of course does not know whether it would be construed to be on the bill or not.

Mr. MANN. I presume the gentleman could get it in the RECORD if he furnished it to the proper parties.

Mr. STANLEY. It is only a page or two.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has general leave to print, and there will be no special leave granted.

The statement referred to by Mr. STANLEY is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SHELBY M. HARRISON.

The witness was duly sworn by the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. In connection with what Mr. Reed has just said I have tried to be especially careful in going into this very question not to produce witnesses who have had an obsession on the subject or who were prejudiced or who had any grievance against the corporation, because I hope, above all things, to present a cool, unimpassioned account of this condition as it exists.

When Mr. Fitch was on the stand he said something about having submitted his book and other papers from which he quoted and from which Mr. Brandels quoted to the Steel Corporation and its officials. Do you know whether your report, about which I shall ask you later, was submitted to the Steel Corporation and its officials?

Mr. HARRISON. I do. It is the policy of the magazine. Of course, as you know, one of the editors of the magazine is a man who was a director of the Pittsburgh Survey under which these other investigations were made, Mr. Fitch's being one.

It is the policy of both the magazine and the Pittsburgh Survey to submit any articles or manuscripts for books which would be critical of any particular company or particular person to that person or company before publication, for several reasons, one being to give an oppor-

tunity for the person or company criticized to correct any misstatement of fact.

The purpose of the investigation was to correct conditions that might be viewed by the public as unwholesome. It would not be working along any scientific method toward the solution of these problems if a misstatement of the problem were made. So the first purpose of the Survey was to be sure of its facts.

It, of course, did not always expect the people to whom the manuscripts were submitted to agree with the interpretation of the facts or with the conclusions drawn from the facts. That was a matter of opinion. It did expect, however, that the people to whom the manuscripts were submitted would agree to facts which were facts and which they could not disprove.

So Mr. Fitch's manuscript for his book was submitted to the president of several of the subsidiary companies in the Pittsburgh district who were directly mentioned in the book or in the manuscript. I am of the opinion that it was submitted to some of the New York men. I am not quite sure of that. I know that in his recent articles they have been given to Mr. Bolling in the New York office.

My article in manuscript form was submitted to George Gordon Crawford.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is he?

Mr. HARRISON. He is president of the Tennessee Coal, Iron & Railroad Co.; to Mr. George B. McCormick, president of the Alabama Coal Operators' Association; Mr. James G. Oakley, president of the Board of Convict Inspectors of Alabama, and a number of other people who would view it from a different side. These were employers.

Of course, I submitted it, then, to the men who might know the prison and crime problem purely from a crime-problem side and not from a labor side.

The CHAIRMAN. Who are connected with this Charities Publication Committee? Who are the people who are behind this matter for whom you are working; do you know?

Mr. HARRISON. Robert W. De Forest, chairman, New York. Other members of the committee: Jane Addams, Chicago; Ernest P. Bicknell, Washington; Robert S. Brewster, New York; Charles M. Cabot, Boston; O. K. Cushing, San Francisco; Edward T. Devine, New York; Arthur P. Estabrook, Boston; Lee K. Frankel, New York; James M. Glenn, New York; William Guggenheim, New York; William E. Harmon, New York; Joseph Lee, Boston; Julian W. Mack, Washington; Simon N. Patten, Philadelphia; Jacob A. Rills, New York; Graham Taylor, Chicago; S. W. Woodward, Washington; Frank Tucker, treasurer, New York; Paul U. Kellogg, secretary, New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever made a personal investigation of the labor conditions in any subsidiary of the United States Steel Corporation?

Mr. HARRISON. I investigated the handling of criminals in the State of Alabama, and it touched on the labor conditions in the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., inasmuch as they hire some city and county convicts.

The CHAIRMAN. Under what auspices were you acting at that time?

Mr. HARRISON. Under the auspices of the Survey Magazine.

Mr. REED. Did you say that they "hired" convicts, or that they hire them now?

Mr. HARRISON. At the time I made my investigation they had in their employ State and county convicts.

The CHAIRMAN. What number of convicts were then in the employ of the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co.?

Mr. HARRISON. They, of course, vary almost from day to day, because as fast as men are convicted they are brought into the camp, and of course men are continually serving out their time and going away, but the average was about 360 State convicts and 240 county.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Did the witness fix the time of this?

Mr. HARRISON. In May and June.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Of last year?

Mr. HARRISON. Of last year, 1911; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How many of the convicts, county and State, were there who were employed in all the mines about at that time?

Mr. HARRISON. For the last five years the total number of convicts in the State, the average per year throughout the State, was about 2,500 State convicts and 700 county convicts. About 200 of these were men who were not able to work, mostly tubercular convicts, who were in the prison at Wetumpka, which is practically a tuberculosis camp, leaving 3,000, and, roughly, 1,500 of those were contracted out into the coal mines, which means they went into the Birmingham district, because that is where all the coal mines are located.

The CHAIRMAN. What per cent of this 1,500 who were utilized as miners did the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co. secure at the time you were there?

Mr. HARRISON. Three hundred and sixty and 240 makes 600; 600 would be 40 per cent of 1,500.

Mr. BEALL. Did the 1,500 represent the State and county convicts?

Mr. HARRISON. Together; yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Let us understand right here what you mean by State convicts and county convicts.

Mr. HARRISON. The distinction is—at least it is supposed to be—that the State convict is a man who has committed a more serious crime than a county convict, a felony, whereas a county convict is a misdemeanor.

Mr. BARTLETT. The county convicts are those who are tried, probably in the inferior courts, for misdemeanors or small-grade felonies, and the State convicts are those who are tried in the courts having exclusive jurisdiction of felonies, or where people are convicted of felonies in the higher courts.

Mr. HARRISON. That is my impression. I am not certain of the legal side of the matter entirely. I know that the county convicts are men who are convicted of lesser crimes.

The CHAIRMAN. Of lesser crimes than a felony?

Mr. HARRISON. Of lesser crimes than a felony; yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. State convicts are those that are sentenced by the court to the penitentiary or to such public works as the superintendent of the penitentiary or those having charge of it may direct, and the county convicts are those who are hired out—I suppose that is so in Alabama; it has been so in Georgia—by the county authorities, who are convicted and subjected to the payment of a fine or alternative imprisonment. Is that about right?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. And in the first case the State gets the pay or the hire, and in the other it goes to the county authorities?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Right at this point, speaking of the offenses for which these county convicts are sent up: It is an offense punishable by fine or imprisonment, is it not, to do such things as shooting or hunting or gaming or card playing, playing at cards or dominoes or racing, whether for money or not, on the Sabbath day? Those are offenses punishable by a fine of from \$10 to \$20 or imprisonment in the State of Alabama?

Mr. HARRISON. If you are reading the statement I made there?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. That is true. I have not all of that quite at my fingers' ends. That statement is true.

The CHAIRMAN (reading). Any person or persons who play or engage in the playing of any baseball, or foot ball, or tennis, or golf on Sunday in any public place where people resort for such purposes, is guilty of a misdemeanor and may be fined from \$20 to \$50.

Mr. HARRISON. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. It is against the law to walk on the right of way of a railroad?

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that men have been arrested and sentenced to prison for doing that in the past, but that the authorities have been a little more lenient in the last year or two because of one very unfortunate incident where a small boy, or a young boy, had been arrested for trespassing on the railroad track, and sent up for 60 days; and he was sent to the mine. He knew nothing of mining and nothing of its dangers, and he got in the way of a car and had his leg cut off, and was crippled for life for this very small offense. That has been, so I am told, more or less of a lesson, and they have been a little less strict in enforcing that law since.

Mr. BARTLETT. Do you mean that the misdemeanor convicts in Alabama, the county convicts, as you have designated them, were worked in the mines, Mr. Harrison?

Mr. HARRISON. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. There was an accident occurred in one of those mines a short time ago, was there not?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; there was an explosion at the Banner Mine.

The CHAIRMAN. Was anybody hurt?

Mr. HARRISON. One hundred and twenty-three men were killed.

The CHAIRMAN. Were any of these the county convicts, sent up for these petty offenses, like playing golf on Sunday, walking on the railroad tracks, and so on?

Mr. HARRISON. I have a statement here of the percentage. Perhaps I might best read that paragraph:

"Last April 123 negro convicts working in the Banner Mine, operated at that time by the Pratt Consolidated Coal Co., were instantly killed by an explosion. Seventy-two of the convicts were from Jefferson County, in which Birmingham is located; 21 out of the 72, or 30 per cent, were convicted of offenses so minor that their sentences, aside from costs, did not exceed 20 days—mainly for carrying concealed weapons, gaming, assault, vagrancy, or violating the prohibition law. Five others were serving sentences of 30 days, and 1 man was within 8 days of his release when he was killed. Another had been convicted only 5 days before the explosion. One hundred and twenty-three persons in the custody of the State, without voice as to the nature of their work, lost their lives in serving their sentences."

Those were county convicts. That gives some indication of the type of the offenses.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is true that in a majority of these cases of what you call misdemeanor convicts, they are sentenced to pay a fine, or, in default thereof, to be punished as they are punished?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The fine is imposed, and in default of that they must work it out?

Mr. HARRISON. They must work it out; yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. In the mines, according to the law of Alabama?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes. You understand that not all men are sent to the mines, however.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. HARRISON. No. I say that 50 per cent of the convicts are sent to the coal mines, and that some of them are sent to the turpentine camps. The State has a farm where it has a couple of hundred, and they have a stove factory where some of them are employed.

The CHAIRMAN. How are these convicts sent up for misdemeanors procured? In what way are they obtained? How does the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co. and these other companies get hold of them? That is what I want to know.

Mr. HARRISON. The contracts are advertised, and the companies bid for them. They are let to the highest bidder.

The CHAIRMAN. These people are just put up and sold to the highest bidder?

Mr. HARRISON. They contract for the convicts for a certain length of time, and they take all that the county has; that is, of course, they keep coming as fast as they are convicted.

The CHAIRMAN. They agree, in advance, to take the supply, whatever it may be?

Mr. HARRISON. They do.

The CHAIRMAN. No matter what they are convicted for, how long or how short the term, if they have any term of imprisonment, they take them and work out that term, is that it?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Whether they are old or young, black or white, convicted of a felony or anything else?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How do they get these people into these mining camps? Does the State or the county send them there, or do they get them?

Mr. HARRISON. The State brings the State convicts, and mining camps—the companies—send a man to the county seat where a man is convicted, and bear the expense of the man, of course, that they send, and the convicts to the camp, and upon his release they send him back to his county seat, bearing the expense, and sending a man with him.

The CHAIRMAN. After these people are procured and gotten into these camps, how are they retained there?

Mr. HARRISON. Of course they have a prison, something, at least, that is called a prison, with a wall around it. The men are kept in prison when they are not at work. When they are at work they are in the mines, where the guarding is very easy, and escape is rather difficult there.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they pay for these convicts, county and State?

Mr. HARRISON. The State convicts are paid more or less on a piece basis. I mean to say that the companies pay by the month for men in the different task groups. The average comes somewhere near the common labor rate for State convicts.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what they pay for State convicts? Those guilty of a felony?

Mr. HARRISON. I know what the Tennessee Co. pays.

The CHAIRMAN. What does the Tennessee Co. pay?

Mr. HARRISON. The Tennessee Co. made a contract several years ago in which it agreed to pay \$46 per month per man in the first class, and there was a gradual lowering of the rate down to a man in the fourth class for which it paid \$10.50. They also, at the same time, agreed to a sliding scale in practice which would slide upward and not downward; that is, any increases in the wage paid to free labor in the district would cause a proportionate raise of payment for the convicts; and since this contract went into effect there have been increases in the free labor in the district which have brought the payment for men in the first class from \$46 to \$50.70 per month, for men in the fourth class to \$11.57.

The CHAIRMAN. What do they pay a month for these county convicts, the young fellows?

Mr. HARRISON. They vary between different companies, but the average was estimated to me by the president of the Alabama Coal Operators' Association as \$12.50 per man per month; I should say per person per month, as that includes men, women, and youths.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they feed these county convicts? Does the company do it, or does the State do it?

Mr. HARRISON. The company does.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know what it costs to feed those convicts per day?

Mr. HARRISON. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know about what it costs?

Mr. HARRISON. I know what it costs to feed the men in the county jails before they are sent to the camps. That cost runs from 7 to 10 cents, depending upon the number of men.

Mr. BARTLETT. Per day.

Mr. HARRISON. Per day, depending upon the number of men. I should say that the convicts in the camps are fed better than that. My guess would be—if you care for a guess?

The CHAIRMAN. An estimate.

Mr. HARRISON. About 15 cents a day.

The CHAIRMAN. About 15 cents a day to feed them?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

Mr. MCGILLICUDDY. Who provides the lodging?

Mr. HARRISON. The company.

The CHAIRMAN. I was going to take that up.

They are also provided with lodging?

Mr. HARRISON. By the companies—the company owns the prison.

The CHAIRMAN. What sort of lodging do they get? How are they housed, bedded, and so on? Just describe those places in which they keep them at night.

Mr. HARRISON. The prison consists, usually, of a frame building.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is this the Steel Corporation that he is talking about?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; this is the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co., alone, that I am talking about.

Mr. YOUNG. I understood the witness to be talking about conditions generally, there. Is not that correct, Mr. Harrison?

Mr. HARRISON. I was talking with regard to the food—about conditions in general; yes.

Mr. YOUNG. Yes.

Mr. HARRISON. You understand I did not go down there to investigate the Steel Corporation convict system as a system. I investigated the whole system of handling criminals in Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you see the food as it was prepared in the kitchens, or anywhere, of the Steel Corporation?

Mr. HARRISON. I saw food that was being prepared in the prison at mine No. 12 of the Tennessee Co. That prison, however, housed the State convicts that were employed by the Tennessee Co. I was told there by the men who were preparing the food what was the customary daily ration.

The CHAIRMAN. For both county and State convicts?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell me about how they are housed in the barracks or prison, or whatever you choose to call it, of the Tennessee Coal & Iron Co. there in Alabama; how these convicts are provided for, at night.

Mr. HARRISON. They are housed in prisons, as I say, which are made up of large cells; they call them cells; they are really large rooms, which accommodate from 30 to 60 men. The sanitary conditions in those that I saw were good. The beds were double beds, two men sleeping in a bed.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men in a bed?

Mr. HARRISON. Two or three.

The CHAIRMAN. How are these beds made? What do they consist of? Are they oak bedsteads, or brass bedsteads, or what kind of bedsteads do they sleep in?

Mr. HARRISON. They are rather simple bedsteads. I do not think they are oak. I think they have a pine framework, with some kind of strapping underneath, ropes and canvas.

Mr. BARTLETT. Bed cords?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; with a tick and blanket and pillow.

The CHAIRMAN. What is in the tick?

Mr. HARRISON. I can only say that my impression is that it is straw. I did not open any of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn. All debate upon this paragraph is closed by order of the committee a few moments ago. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. There was no order of the committee in regard to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is mistaken.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I regret exceedingly to weary the patience of the committee at this hour by making any further reference to a subject that has already been discussed to-day. I fear, however, I have been guilty perhaps of an injustice to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr.

STANLEY], and I desire this opportunity to express my exceeding regret that I have possibly been placed in that attitude. I have perhaps done that injustice to him because it may have been assumed in something I have said that he was not intending to be fair. Whatever may have been his habitual conduct heretofore in this respect I am quite sure his conduct to-day has entirely disproved any such suggestion I might possibly have erroneously indulged in, because he had generously, completely, beautifully, and magnificently placed in the RECORD a table of figures which absolutely disprove the statement he made and absolutely prove the contention that I put forth.

The gentleman started with his fundamental proposition that nine-tenths of the men who work in the mines of Minnesota, particularly specifying the Mesabi district, were a coming-and-going crowd of individuals who did not stay there for a period of five years. I quote from the table which he has placed in the RECORD to substantiate his position, and I find that in the Mesabi Range from that record there were 13,289 American citizens [applause on the Republican side] born in America and only 17,310 of foreign birth, and I ask and invite the gentleman's attention to the further fact that if it shall be considered those of the 17,000 who have been naturalized, more than 75 per cent are American citizens to-day swearing allegiance to the American flag. [Applause on the Republican side.] He said that not 5 per cent had been in this country five years, and yet the table that he submitted shows that more than 12 per cent had been there for more than 10 years, practically dating from the time of the beginning of the development of that region, and that 32 per cent had been there for a greater period of time than five years. Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the table which he submitted bears this astounding fact, that of the 10,000 employees of the Steel Corporation included in that report, 30 per cent are American citizens of the Lake Superior district entirely. I said 30 per cent American citizens, I mean 30 per cent American-born people, and the number naturalized is not included; and if we will extend that and include those who are naturalized you will find that 70 to 75 per cent is a fair estimate. From the men who are engaged in those mines, who, with skilled hands, managed the steam shovels that dug that ore, were taken the men who for the last five years have dug the Panama Canal, and the world does not furnish their superior. That skill which enabled them to perform that part in that great international epoch-making work they learned in the ore mines of Minnesota, and their brethren left there are their equals in skilled strength, American courage, manhood, and spirit. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I want to call the gentleman's attention to a further fact, that these miners, from their earnings, each stepped up when work was over, with his candle in his hat and his begrimed suit of oil-cloth on his person, and dropped into a common fund from his hard earnings the sum that built the first monument ever erected by human hands to the memory of the martyred President of the United States, William McKinley. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Can I have two minutes more?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I would like to indulge the gentleman, but, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the paragraph close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama moves that all debate on the paragraph be now closed.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

169. Articles or wares not specially provided for in this section; if composed wholly or in part of platinum, gold, or silver, and articles or wares plated with gold or silver, and whether partly or wholly manufactured, 50 per cent ad valorem; if composed wholly or in chief value of iron, steel, lead, copper, nickel, pewter, zinc, aluminum, or other metal, but not plated with gold or silver, and whether partly or wholly manufactured, 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. HEFLIN, and Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE] is recognized.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, paragraph 169, on page 45, line 20, by striking out the figures "25" and inserting the figures "45."

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, in speaking on the amendment which I have offered I speak at the request of constituents whom I do not know, but they say to me that they voted the Democratic ticket in November last, and probably they did not vote for me.

Mr. MANN. They never will vote the Democratic ticket again.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. In North Attleboro there are 104 men who supported the Democratic Party during the recent electoral campaign who asked me to use my good offices against any reduction in the rate of duty now levied upon jewelry, silverware, and kindred products should changes in tariff rates be contemplated. They speak of the necessity of maintaining the present schedules on account of North Attleboro being entirely dependent upon the industry of the manufacture of jewelry and the large variety of ornaments, buckles, and many of the specialties included in the metal schedule. As I have said, there are 104 men who claim that they voted the Democratic ticket, and not one of them do I know personally.

I also have a petition from the Democratic town committee of North Attleboro, a committee elected by Democratic voters of the town at the election in November, in order to promote the best interests of the Democratic Party, and they make a request of a similar nature to me, and they ask me to prevent any changes from those existing in the present law.

I also have a petition from the board of trade of the town of North Attleboro, which, of course, is entirely nonpartisan.

I also have a petition from the Democratic town committee of Attleboro, a committee elected by the Democratic voters of that town to promote the best interests of the Democratic Party, to the same effect as heretofore stated, and also a petition from the Democratic town committee of the town of Norton, which is in the district which I have the honor to represent, and the petition is of the same nature as those to which I have heretofore referred. I have not spoken to a single Democrat in either one of these towns in regard to any measure, unless they were present when I carried on my campaign last fall for nomination and election upon the Republican ticket. On each of these occasions I announced myself as a Republican who believed in protection to American industries and American labor, and as one who had stood upon every Republican platform from the time of Abraham Lincoln down to the present time [applause on the Republican side], and stated that I had voted for every Republican candidate for President.

And I also informed them that I had voted for the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act, which I believed was the most beneficial act for the people of the district which I had the honor to represent that had ever been put upon the statute books. I made no apology to anybody for anything I thought or said, but I said if any Democrat wanted to vote for me, he must not vote for me thinking there were any Democratic ideas in my mind. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I received a number of Democratic votes, although I did not agree with the principles of the voters of that party, but I believed that those who would vote for me believed at least I was honest in my views. So I appear here to-night on the request of the Democrats of the district I represent, men who are interested in the jewelry business, probably some of them as owners and others as workers in that industry. There are more than 130 jewelry factories in these three towns above referred to. Consequently the metal schedule is of vast importance to them, and all the work they do requires great skill to prepare for the market the great varieties of goods which their employers find a market for. They do this work for the purpose of maintaining the life of the towns, and they say distinctly that if this bill as prepared goes into effect it will work very injuriously to their material interests. I appear here as a Representative upon this floor entitled to speak in behalf of constituents, certainly, to whom I owe no obligation, and who owe none to me. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The following are the petitions to which I referred in the foregoing remarks:

NORTH ATTLEBORO, MASS., December 30, 1912.

To the COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIRS: In view of the proposed legislation on the customs tariff, the undersigned, who one and all supported the Democratic Party during the recent electoral campaign, take the liberty of asking you to use your good offices against any reduction in the rate of duty now levied upon jewelry, silverware, and kindred products should such reduction be contemplated.

As you are aware, the Attleboros practically owe their existence as manufacturing towns to the establishment and maintenance of the great jewelry and silverware industries, which are possible only under a tariff which will equalize the difference in the cost of labor and overhead charges between the United States and foreign countries. In these lines the difference is so enormous that even with the present duty of 85 per cent the competition has been exceedingly keen, and we are informed that even with the seemingly high duty the imports have greatly increased over those of preceding years.

A reduction in the tariff even to a small degree would therefore mean greatly increased foreign competition, with consequent lessening of our output and scarcity of work.

It is a fact that under the construction put upon the present paragraph relating to our products, by which the duty has been reduced, whole lines of articles have been discontinued, and we greatly fear and

believe that any further reduction will result in the curtailment or, indeed, the actual closing down of our factories, with enforced idleness and distress.

It is unnecessary to point out to you how vital this matter is to us as workmen in these factories, and we urge you most earnestly to do your utmost to prevent any reduction in this duty.

John J. Soper, Albert Green, Wm. B. Maloney, John H. McCann, J. F. McDermott, Daniel T. M. Carlien, Joseph Gormley, Henry Carr, Henry C. Hoessins, D. O. Leary, William H. King, James D. Fulton, James J. Brennan, Joseph A. Drenen, Jack M. Douglass, J. E. Genriss, James McLuhlin, Walter T. Barrows, Joseph P. Kelly, Charles A. Heath, John R. Wilson, William J. McNally, D. F. Carroll, Frank P. Roddy, James Laverie, Alvin Barrows, James J. McGowan, William T. Soper, Edward McAvoy, W. F. Corrigan, Dennis A. Flynn, Jr., Joseph C. Doran, John Kiernan, John E. Devlin, Geles Paquet, William G. Moore, Ernest Toothill, Ed. E. Ostenholm, David Hanna, George Ranbeault, Samuel P. Totten, Wm. Donnelly, Anthony P. Viard, Dennis J. Murphy, Joseph McKeon, Henry Kelly, Frank Edwards, Daniel Kelly, Maurice H. Kiley, George O'Neill, Edwin E. Nelson, J. L. Donnelly, Walter W. Cooke, George B. Loughlin, Aug. Schilling, F. N. Averill, Fred Viard, J. D. Fontain, T. G. Issler, Mike McQueeney, Walter Grimley, Fred A. Roessler, A. C. Roessler, George A. Fatagier, Y. Daborowski, Joseph Boisvert, Euclide Boisvert, George Braltshau, E. Payson Bennett, John J. Morse, William Wynne, John Bauman, William Cassidy, Walter Etter, George Coutona, William Pierce, Joseph L. N. Lemay, Peter Cabbot, Arthur G. Letourneau, Enset Pincult, Ubald Sde Carufel, James Flynn, S. E. Gardner, Owen Dolan, Joseph W. Brennan, Pat J. Stemfard, Hugh Gormley, Arthyr Sde Carufel, P. Gentilotti, J. E. Lambert, Paul L. Pratt, J. N. Sweet, E. M. Allen, Charles Benoit, B. A. Bennett, Cyril J. Lecompte, Eugene Austin, William B. Lincoln, Corad Lamarre, Mathew Cook, John G. MacDonald, Robert Picken, Martin H. Maguire.

NORTH ATTLEBORO, MASS., January 27, 1913.

The COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: In connection with the proposed tariff legislation at the coming session of Congress the Democratic town committee of North Attleboro, a committee elected by the Democratic voters of the town to promote the best interests of the Democratic Party, has instructed me to forward to you a copy of the following resolution passed by them on January 27, 1913:

Whereas the customs tariff law is about to be revised by the United States Congress; and

Whereas this committee recognizes that the welfare and prosperity of the town of North Attleboro is practically dependent upon its jewelry and silverware industries, which in turn are made possible only by an adequately protective tariff against the low-priced labor of foreign countries; and

Whereas the committee has been informed and believes that even under the present rate of duty on similar goods the imports are steadily increasing: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this committee record its disapproval of any reduction of duty upon jewelry, silverware, and kindred articles, and that it urge upon Congress the necessity of maintaining the present rates; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this committee be, and he is hereby, instructed to forward to the Ways and Means Committee of Congress, to the Representatives of this district, and to the United States Senators of this State a copy of this resolution.

D. M. E. VAUCE, Chairman.
A. FRANK LYNCH, Secretary.
HENRY P. REYNOLDS.
FREDERIC R. WHITE.
FRANK A. BROWN.
JAMES L. MARRILL.
THOS. F. COADY.
DENNIS E. O'NEILL.
JAMES E. SMITH.
GEORGE A. WARREN.

NORTH ATTLEBORO, MASS., January 16, 1913.

The COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: In connection with the proposed tariff legislation at the coming session of Congress, the Board of Trade of North Attleboro, a board organized to promote the best interests of the town of North Attleboro, has instructed me to forward to you a copy of the following resolutions, passed by them on January 16, 1913:

Whereas the customs tariff law is about to be revised by the United States Congress;

Whereas this board of trade recognizes that the jewelry and silverware industries are the only industries of the town of North Attleboro and that the people of North Attleboro are, therefore, dependent upon these industries, which in turn are made possible only by an adequately protective tariff against the low-priced labor of Europe and other countries;

Whereas the board of trade has been informed and believes that even under the present rates of duty on jewelry and silverware the imports are steadily increasing; and

Whereas this board has further been informed and believes that many improper classifications under the present tariff act to the serious disadvantage of the jewelry and silverware industries are due to the inclusion of the words "gold," "silver," and "platinum" in the final paragraph of the so-called metal schedule: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this board of trade record its disapproval of any reduction in the rates of duty upon jewelry, silverware, and kindred articles, and that it urge upon Congress the necessity of maintaining the present rates; and be it further

Resolved, That this board record its disapproval of the inclusion of the words "gold," "silver," and "platinum" in the same paragraph with iron, steel, tin, lead, etc., and favor a special paragraph either to precede or follow the paragraph referring to the cheaper metals, and

in this new paragraph the same rates be approved as are approved for the so-called jewelry paragraph; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this board be, and he is hereby, instructed to forward to the Ways and Means Committee of Congress, to the Representative of this district, and to the United States Senators from this State a copy of this resolution.

Respectfully, yours,

CARL A. HEMPEL, Secretary.

ATTLEBORO, MASS., January 27, 1913.

The COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: In connection with the proposed tariff legislation at the coming session of Congress the Democratic town committee of Attleboro, a committee elected by the Democratic voters of the town to promote the best interests of the Democratic Party, has instructed me to forward to you a copy of the following resolution passed by them on January 27, 1913:

Whereas the customs-tariff law is about to be revised by the United States Congress; and

Whereas this committee recognizes that the welfare and prosperity of the town of Attleboro is practically dependent upon its jewelry and silverware industries, which in turn are made possible only by an adequately protective tariff against the low-priced labor of foreign countries; and

Whereas the committee has been informed and believes that even under the present rate of duty on similar goods the imports are steadily increasing: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this committee record its disapproval of any reduction of duty upon jewelry, silverware, and kindred articles, and that it urge upon Congress the necessity of maintaining the present rates; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this committee be, and he is hereby, instructed to forward to the Ways and Means Committee of Congress, to the Representatives of this district, and to the United States Senators of this State a copy of this resolution.

WILLIAM J. KENNEY, Chairman.
CHARLES P. PREHAN, Secretary.
JOHN W. CODY.
FRANK B. KINNEY.
GILMAN L. BATES.
THOMAS F. KEENE.
HUGH GAFFNEY.
JAMES F. SIMMS.
T. FRANCIS DALY.
FRED S. COBB.

NORTON, MASS., January, 1913.

The COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: In connection with the proposed tariff legislation at the coming session of Congress, the Democratic town committee of Norton, a committee elected by the Democratic voters of the town to promote the best interests of the Democratic Party, has instructed me to forward to you a copy of the following resolution passed by them:

Whereas the customs-tariff law is about to be revised by the United States Congress; and

Whereas this committee recognizes that the jewelry and silverware industries are the chief industries of Norton, and that the people of that town are therefore largely dependent upon these industries, which in turn are made possible only by an adequately protective tariff against the low-priced labor of foreign countries; and

Whereas the committee has been informed and believes that even under the present rate of duty on similar goods, the imports are steadily increasing: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this committee record its disapproval of any reduction of duty upon jewelry, silverware, and kindred articles, and that it urge upon Congress the necessity of maintaining the present rates; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of this committee be, and he is hereby, instructed to forward to the Ways and Means Committee of Congress, to the Representative of this district, and to the United States Senators of this State a copy of this resolution.

C. H. MAKEPEACE,
Chairman Democratic Town Committee.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on this paragraph in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. I desire 5 minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. I also would like 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I regret we can not progress faster. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. REILLY of Connecticut having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 2973. An act making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, May 1, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 4477) to grant compensation to letter carriers and post-office clerks injured in the performance of their duties; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 4478) to authorize the completion of the unfinished portion of the Government road between Hoopa Valley and Blue Lake, Humboldt County, Cal.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BRITTEN: A bill (H. R. 4479) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the opening, maintenance, protection, and operation of the Panama Canal, and the sanitation and government of the Canal Zone," approved August 24, 1912; and also amending an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 4480) to reimburse certain fire insurance companies the amount paid by them for property destroyed by fire in suppressing the bubonic plague in the Territory of Hawaii in the years 1899 and 1900; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOBSON (by request): A bill (H. R. 4481) to create educational parental courts; to the Committee on Education.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4482) to provide for the education of deficient children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 4483) providing compulsory education in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4525) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CURLEY: A bill (H. R. 4526) to regulate employment of substitute clerks and carriers in offices of the first and second class of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 4527) providing for the improvement of the Harlem River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: Resolution (H. Res. 82) requesting the Postmaster General to advise the House of Representatives as to the names and number of men employed as post-office inspectors; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEELEY: Resolution (H. Res. 83) directing the Attorney General to collect a certain sum of money from the Missouri Pacific Railroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS: A memorial of the Legislature of Massachusetts relative to an amendment of the Constitution of the United States prohibiting the practice of polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL of California: A bill (H. R. 4484) granting a pension to Josephine W. Heap; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4485) granting an increase of pension to Laura Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4486) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Charles R. Stevens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLACKMON: A bill (H. R. 4487) for the relief of George P. Plowman; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4488) for the relief of the heirs of Philip S. Fulford, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BRYAN: A bill (H. R. 4489) for the relief of W. F. Crawford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 4490) granting a pension to Eveline H. Wheeler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 4491) granting a pension to Myron Horton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 4492) to restore Capt. Harold L. Jackson, retired, to the active list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4493) for the relief of Leo Metze; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 4494) granting a pension to Sadie M. Jungerman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 4495) granting a pension to Mary C. Barnum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4496) granting a pension to Thomas J. Mullin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4497) granting an increase of pension to John F. Stallsmith; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4498) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Shrieves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4499) granting an increase of pension to Maria A. Sinclair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4500) granting an increase of pension to John Ricksecker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4501) granting an increase of pension to William A. Barrett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4502) granting an increase of pension to Gabriel B. Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4503) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Arntz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4504) granting an increase of pension to Adam J. Sherman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 4505) granting a pension to Katherine Hemen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 4506) granting an increase of pension to Joel Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 4507) granting a pension to Willis Mollohan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4508) granting an increase of pension to George W. James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 4509) granting an increase of pension to Josephine R. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4510) granting a pension to Jennie L. Tate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 4511) granting an increase of pension to Abner H. Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4512) granting a pension to Gertrude Ballou; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 4513) for the relief of William E. Farrell; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 4514) for the relief of Jaime W. Overton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 4515) granting a pension to Caroline Bast; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4516) granting a pension to William A. Pfaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4517) granting a pension to Rachel M. Diebold; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4518) granting an increase of pension to Wilder E. Walling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4519) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4520) granting an increase of pension to William E. Beymer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4521) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. McKim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4522) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Koons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4523) granting an increase of pension to Emma C. Kennedy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4524) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Morrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 4528) for the relief of the estate of Perry P. Benson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 4529) for the relief of Robert C. Schenck, late paymaster, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4530) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Loker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4531) for the relief of the estate of George Lloyd Raley; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 4532) granting a pension to Dana A. Smally; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4533) granting an increase of pension to Jane Cramer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4534) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4535) for the relief of Erskine R. Hayes; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Missouri, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also (by request), petition of Ferdinand W. Schleuder, of Hermann, and J. G. Hildenstein, of Warrington, Mo., against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of the council of the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation for acquiring Government ownership of all telephone and telegraph systems; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of E. D. Murphy, of Antwerp; Andrew S. Burt, of Van Wert; S. P. Wannemocher, of Cloverdale; Oscar C. Wyatt, of Drovers Hill; and Clarence C. Bowyer, of Paulding, Ohio, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of Will F. Frary and J. E. Snider, of Burbank, Ohio, and Charles H. Beck, West Lafayette, Ohio, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of sundry citizens of the twenty-second congressional district of Illinois, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petition of Mrs. Mary Jones, of El Monte; 431 other beet growers, farmers, and other citizens of the following towns in the State of California: Alvarado, Arroyo Grande, Artesia, Betteravia, Colusa, Compton, Chino, El Monte, Hynes, Irvington, Huntington Beach, Marysville, Meridian, Moss, Oceana, Oxnard, Pacific Grove, Pleasanton, Salinas, Santa Maria, San Francisco, Soledad, Spreckels, Watsonville, Woodland, Anaheim, Downey, Garden Grove, Gilroy, Laws, Monterey, Santa Ana, Westminster; and the following firms and companies of San Francisco, Cal.: Wright Wire Co., A. J. & J. R. Cook (Inc.), S. F. Bowser & Co., Stauffer Chemical Co., Paul Rieger & Co., the Robert Dollar Co., Carlson Currier Co., Gantner & Mattern Co., Pacific Oil & Lead Works, Steiger & Kerr Stove & Foundry Co., and the Pacific Wire Rope Co., of Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRODBECK: Petition of 35 citizens of the twentieth congressional district of Pennsylvania, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of Herman Weil, W. O. Davenport, and R. E. Lee against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Fox Croft Grange, No. 1220, of Downingtown, Pa., and citizens of West Chester, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation giving international protection to all migratory birds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Trainer, Pa., favoring the passage of legislation to prevent the opening of the Panama Exposition on Sundays; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of sundry citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the hand window glass manufacturers of Pittsburgh, Pa., relative to brief filed by Simon Bache & Co., of New York City, regarding the duty on window glass; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Waltham Piano Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., against any duty being placed on ivory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALE: Petitions of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of W. A. Slade, of Brooklyn, N. Y., against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Stewart Hess Co., of New York City, against the clause prohibiting importation of feathers, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. L. Holt, of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the clause prohibiting importation of feathers, etc., and opposing the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Amherst, Wolaston, and Uxbridge; of Granville R. Farrer and other citizens of Abington; Mrs. J. Malcolm Forbes and other citizens of Milton and Boston, Mass., favoring the repeal of the clause exempting American vessels from the payment of tolls in the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of Edward J. Graeb and Spencer Lathrop, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Braid Manufacturers' Association, of New York, N. Y., favoring assessment of all braids, under paragraph 369, with laces, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Butler-Ward Co., of New York, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on bound books; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Standard Importing Co. and Austin Nichols & Co., of New York, N. Y., against assessment of fee for filing protests against assessment of duties by the collector of customs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Cloak, Suit, and Skirt Manufacturers' Association, of Cleveland, Ohio, against the same rate of duty on finished clothing as upon woolen cloth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Van Wie Pump Co., of Syracuse, N. Y., against the removal of the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Syracuse Gardens Co., of New York, against any change in tariff affecting products of the soil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of sundry citizens of the twenty-third congressional district of New York, against taxing mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: Petition of the Passaic Board of Trade, of Passaic, N. J., against any change of the tariff schedules affecting the wool, cotton, handkerchief, chemical, metal, and paper industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of the National Business League of America, favoring the retention in the Consular Service of officials of demonstrated efficiency; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Cigarmakers' Union No. 301, Akron, Pa., protesting against any reduction of the tariff on tobacco and cigars imported from the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILL: Petition of Mario Catavi, Hoboken, N. J., and John R. Parsons and 2 other citizens of Jersey City, N. J., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of the Columbia and Snake River Waterways Association, protesting against the repeal of the free-tolls portion of the Panama Canal act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Fred R. Haas and 375 other citizens of San Francisco, Whittier, Moss, Chino, Compton, Artesia, Alvarado, King City, Buena Park, Betteravia, Salinas, Oxnard, Gilroy, Watsonville, Los Alamitos, Sargent, Spreckels, Pleasanton, Castroville, Hollister, Meridian, Santa Ana, and El Monte, all in the State of California, protesting against the proposed reduction in the duty on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Walnut Street Business Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the proposed increase on personal-baggage exemption of duty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MITCHELL: Petition of John D. Brooks and other citizens of Natick; Dr. Horace Bumstead and other members of the Harvard Congregational Church, Brookline; and President Ellen F. Pendleton, Prof. Mary Whiton Calkins, and others of Wellesley College, all in the State of Massachusetts, favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls or the arbitration of the question at issue with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOTT: Papers to accompany bill (H. R. 4469) granting a special pension to Ella M. Becker; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers, against the reduction of duties on cotton goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry chocolate workers of Fulton, N. Y., against the reduction of the duty on chocolate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: Petition of Charles Debold, Bernhard J. Osmer, Frank Emmett, Conrad Haaren, L. Eyring, A. H. Fersch, J. Wadsworth, and Conrad W. Brech, against the reduction of the duty on cocoa and chocolate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Walter S. Rapelji, Irving S. Roney, C. S. Findlay, Adolph Celtz, John Lamerdin, Frederick J. Brittner, sr., Miss M. Estelle Lifhtbourn, J. A. Armstrong, Daniel A. Dolan, Julia E. Carpenter, F. J. Bittner, Joseph Hartel, John W. Farmer, Charles Herman, Joseph Sommers, C. A. McConnell, H. H. Wallace, J. C. Gounig, Lowell M. Palmer, Warren E. Burrows, and Willis F. Taplin, all of New York and Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Richard McCormick, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against any reduction of the tariff on bound books; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Miss A. Dunn and Miss Lillie Oberglock, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against any reduction of the tariff on all lithograph work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of William E. Lynn, Henry F. Reining, Joseph B. Lomax, Frank R. Treasure, Mrs. M. Buckley, and James D. Ackerman, all of New York, N. Y., protesting against placing Bibles on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Moebie Lithograph Co., Mrs. T. A. Reilly, and Louis Reilly, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against any reduction in the tariff on lithographic work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Charles Ainsworth, H. T. Daniels, Richard P. Boucher, Edward Everett Rice, Nathan E. Moore, and George F. Troy, all of Providence, R. I., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Miss Alice Hall Walter, Providence, R. I., favoring the passage of legislation preventing the importation of feathers and plumes of wild birds for commercial purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Low-Taussig-Karpeles Co., Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of legislation to collect a filing fee on each protest against the assessment of illegal duties or for reappraisal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of Roger Pierce, Myrom Richardson, and other business men of Boston, and the Samuel B. Capen's Men's Class, Central Congregational Church, Jamaica Plain, favoring the repeal of the clause exempting American vessels from the payment of tolls in the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of sundry citizens of California, favoring the passage of legislation compelling concerns selling goods direct to the consumer by mail to contribute their portion of the funds for the development of the local community, town, and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Connecticut, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of Dr. Edward Waldo Emerson and other citizens of Concord; President Clara H. Nash and members of the West Acton Woman's Christian Temperance Union, all of Massachusetts, favoring the repeal of the clause in the Panama Canal act exempting American coastwise shipping from the payment of tolls or the arbitration of the question at issue with the British Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, against the income tax for mutual life insurance companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Eastern Millinery Association of New York, N. Y., against the clause prohibiting the importation of aligrettes, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of different towns in New Jersey, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAFFORD: Petition of 46 citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of Paul Rieger & Co., San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the proposed increase of duty on materials for the manufacture of perfume; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Globe Grain & Milling Co., Los Angeles, Cal., protesting against an increase of the duty on jute burlap; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco, Cal., protesting against an import duty on wheat, oats, and barley; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Pacific Oil & Lead Works, San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the placing of coconut oil on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Standard Underground Cable Co., Los Angeles, Cal., favoring a differential duty on pig lead and lead-covered wires and cables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Warren & Bailey Manufacturing Co., and 7 other companies of Los Angeles, Cal.; Carlson Currier Co., and 4 other companies of San Francisco, Cal.; and the Holt Manufacturing Co., Stockton, Cal., protesting against the proposed reduction of the tariff on sugar; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: Petition of sundry citizens of the thirty-seventh congressional district of New York, against taxing mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALLIN: Petition of the glove manufacturers of Gloversville, N. Y., protesting against the passage of the provision in House bill 3321 to charge a filing fee on protests against the imposition of duties or appeal for reappraisal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the thirteenth district of New York, protesting against including mutual life insurance companies in the income-tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of the Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Hardin County, Ohio, favoring the passage of legislation for Federal aid for the improvement of public roads, and against a 1 cent letter-postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, May 1, 1913.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday last was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 2973) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-third Congress, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. KERN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll and then proceeded to call the names of the absentees.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that the amendment to Rule XII simply applies to a yeas-and-nays vote.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I should like to have the rule that was adopted read, if the Chair please.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read Rule XII. The Secretary read as follows:

RULE XII. VOTING, ETC.

1. When the yeas and nays are ordered the names of Senators shall be called alphabetically, and each Senator shall, without debate, declare his assent or dissent to the question, unless excused by the Senate; and no Senator shall be permitted to vote after the decision shall have been announced by the presiding officer, but may for sufficient reasons, with unanimous consent, change or withdraw his vote. No motion to suspend this rule shall be in order, nor shall the presiding officer entertain any request to suspend it by unanimous consent. (Jefferson's Manual, Sec. XLI.)

2. When a Senator declines to vote on call of his name he shall be required to assign his reasons therefor, and having assigned them the presiding officer shall submit the question to the Senate, "Shall the Senator, for the reasons assigned by him, be excused from voting?" which shall be decided without debate; and these proceedings shall be had after the roll call and before the result is announced; and any further proceedings in reference thereto shall be after such announcement. (Jefferson's Manual, Secs. XVII, XLI.)

3. Immediately after and before the result of each roll call is ascertained and announced the Secretary shall call the names of the absentees. (Amendment of April 28, 1913.)